DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 717 CE 022 740

AUTHOR	Probst, George; Meredith, Dwight
TITLE	Establishing the Basis for a Multi-Purpose Local Labor Market Information System: Assessment of User Need and Data Availability. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Dept. of Administration, Raleigh.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	498AH70211
PUB DATE	Jan 79
GRANT	G007702137
NOTE	325p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Analysis; Data Collection; Employment Opportunities; Employment Patterns; Employment Statistics; Employment Trends; *Information Needs; *Information Sources; Information Systems; Job Market; *Labor Market; Labor Supply; Manpower Needs; *Needs Assessment; Occupational Information; *Occupational Surveys; Planning; Policy Formation; *State Agencies; Statewide Planning; Systems Development; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

To develop a coordinated interagency effort to improve North Carolina citizen access to employment opportunities, a statewide assessment was conducted of the availability and need for local labor market information in 1977-1978. Need and availability was assessed across five state agencies--Vocational Education, Community Colleges, CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act programs), Vocational Rehabilitation, and Employment Security at both state and local agency offices--by the new instrumentation created for this study. Results obtained made it possible to prioritize twenty-four data categories according to their relative importance to various agencies. These categories covered various demand and supply aspects of market information, such as employment patterns, turnover statistics, vacancies, characteristics of employed and unemployed or discouraged workers, education and training program characteristics, etc. A catalog of data holdings broken out by these categories and by specific data elements across agencies was then established, there being a match between available data documentation and informational needs identified. The study served as a catalyst to initiate a concerted approach to occupational information data needs and to implement the logical first step in developing a Multi-Purpose Occupational Information System capable of providing for the policy planning needs of public and private administrators and individual citizens' career decision needs. (The report includes a 32-page executive summary of data categories, 50-page needs assessment questionnaire, the catalog of data holdings, and 150 pages of tables analyzing agency information needs.) (CP)

ED178717

Final Report

Project No. 498-AH-70-211

Grant No. G00-77-02-137

ESTABLISHING THE BASIS FOR A MULTI-PURPOSE LOCAL LABOR MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEM:

ASSESSMENT OF USER NEED AND DATA AVAILABILITY

By

George Probst and Dwight Meredith
North Carolina
State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee

Department of Administration
State of North Carolina

Raleigh North Carolina

January 1979

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CE 022 740

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Bureau of Occupational Adult Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AUTHORS' ABSTRACT

The North Carolina State Occupational Coordinating Committee conducted a statewide assessment of the availability and need for local labor market information in 1977-78. The need for and availability of occupational information was assessed across five North Carolina State agencies: Vocational Education, Community Colleges, Community Employment (CETA), Vocational Rehabilitation, and Employment Security at both State and local agency offices. The purpose of the project was to develop a coordinated interagency effort to improve the access of North Carolina citizens to employment opportunities. New survey instrumentation was created for a study of user need and data availability. This instrumentation is basic to this report on user informational requirements ranked by importance according to user need. A catalogue of data holdings broken out by twenty-four generalized data categories and by specific data elements across agencies was established. There is a match between the available data documentation and the informational needs identified. The study served as a catalyst for initiating a concerted approach to occupational information data needs. This study implements the logical first step in the development of a Multi-purpose Occupational Information System capable of providing for the policy planning needs of public and private administrators and the career decision needs of individual citizens.

3

PREFACE

Labor market information is a difficult and intricate matter with considerable economic and public policy importance for everyone. Although it is a process that is almost invisible to the general public, labor market information affects employment and unemployment, occupational choice, and career decisions. It is only in recent years that it has begun to receive serious Congressional attention.

This is a difficult, intricate, and complex information problem because in the American economy, the facts are changing every day! Living within the structure of a two-and-a-half trillion dollar ($2,500,000,000,000) gross national product, there are tens of millions of Americans searching for rewarding employment and a satisfying career. This is a phenomenon beyond the scope and grasp of pre-computer understanding and manageability. Despite these difficulties, useful and effective occupational and career information must be developed that is based on accurate, complete, and timely labor market information. To what extent is this available?

The study reported in this volume is a first effort to assess the adequacy of existing data sources to satisfy user needs for labor market information. It is an essential first step to provide North Carolinians with current valid information to enable them to make better decisions and to act successfully in choosing an occupation.

It is during periods of high unemployment that labor market information becomes ever more valuable. It is frequently then most difficult to obtain. Barriers to the flow of information about job vacancies prevent job seekers from finding out about them. It has been established that the provision of more job market information shortens the time of unemployment for many workers, thereby, increasing worker productivity. This, in turn, tends to reduce public welfare costs.

No effective occupational information system can be created without excellent information. With excellent information, counselors and placement officials can provide job information, assessment, counseling, recommendations, referral, and guidance. They can work to aid students and clients to clarify goals, identify skills, reach conclusions, overcome institutional barriers, and gain self-confidence. All individuals involved are dependent for success on certain and sure information.

Accurate, up-to-date labor market information is central to establishing a Multi-purpose Occupational Information System that will provide the framework for future efforts to produce and deliver occupational information. In this volume, the purpose, procedures, and results are fully described so that the process can be duplicated by other states interested in conducting an assessment of labor market information needs and availability.

Those of us at work in North Carolina creating a Multi-purpose Occupational Information System owe a debt of gratitude to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of the U.S. Office of Education for the support of the research basic to this important development.

George E. Probst
Director of Research
NCSOICC

Dwight A. Meredith
Programs Coordinator
NCSOICC

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The devoted cooperation of many individuals and the participation of five North Carolina State agencies have made the accomplishment of this research project possible.

Special thanks are due to Secretary Joseph W. Grimsley, Secretary of the North Carolina Department of Administration, and Chairman of the North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NCSOICC), for seeing in this research study the useful possibilities of conducting an assessment of user need for labor market information.

The Signatory Committee members of the North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee were exemplars of the cooperation that administrators can extend in support of a creative research project. These North Carolina SOICC Committee members are: Preston Johnson, Employment Security Commission; Alan T. Hill, State Board of Education; Bob Philbeck, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; and, Eva Clayton, Department of Natural Resources and Community Development (CETA).

Arnold Zogry, Assistant Secretary for Policy and Management of the North Carolina Department of Administration and Alternate Chariman of the NCSOICC, provided guidance and full support for the research project.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Joyce Kinnison, Executive Director of the NCSOICC, for her vision and support of the development of this research project. Her innumerable valuable suggestions and her success in securing full North Carolina State agency cooperation were essential to the conduct of this project. Our deepest thanks are due to Cari Whittington, Debbie Parrish, and Grace Beaman for their painstaking transformation of data and text into typed pages ready for the printer.

Dr. Donald W. Drewes, President of CONSERVA, Inc., conceived this research project to assess user need and data availability. As a technical resource for the execution of parts of this study, CONSERVA, Inc. was selected because of their staff experience in conducting a recent national needs assessment for vocational education data, familiarity with the legislative background of national efforts to establish a National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and knowledge of North Carolina State level operation of vocational education and CETA planning and program operations. Dr. Drewes and Dr. Douglas S. Katz, Research Associate, CONSERVA, Inc., were the source of many valuable contributions during the study, particularly in the development of the survey instruments. Sally Brower, Research Assistant for CONSERVA, Inc., conducted the field study of data availability and was industrious in the work of data gathering.

The Project Monitor of the North Carolina SOICC research study for the U.S.O.E. Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education was Dr. Jack Wilson. He was the source of helpful guidance, criticism, and encouragement. We have a deep sense of appreciation for the very essential contribution he made.

Chuck Kessler, Bob Johns, Al Little, David Thornton, Faye Barber, and Pete Swenson of the North Carolina Office of State Management Systems contributed immeasurably in providing the computer facilities and expertise for computer analysis of the data.

The North Carolina SOICC is also indebted to numerous other individuals for their participation in the assessment of user need for labor market information. In particular, we would like to express our sincere appreciation to the Technical Advisory Committee who reviewed the survey instrument. This Committee included: Cliff Belcher, Deputy Director, Field Support Section, Division of Vocational Education; Jerry Kivett, Consultant, Field Support Section, Division of Vocational Education; Ken Oleson, Director, Occupational Programs, Department of Community Colleges; Bill Fleming, Labor Economist, Division of Community Development; Dave Garrison, Assistant Director, Bureau of Employment Security Research; Joe Morrow, Chief, Evaluation and Audit, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Edward Wilson, Jr., Education Development Officer, Wayne Community College; John Worthington, Local Director of Vocational Education, Kinston; Doug Hearn, Program Planner, Community Employment, Winston-Salem; Amos T. Cherry, Manager, Employment Security Commission, Wilson; Ann Colenda, Labor Market Analyst, Employment Security Commission, Durham; Jay Collins, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Raleigh; and Landis Barnes, Vocational Evaluator, Durham.

Others deserving special thanks include agency representatives who contributed freely of their time in completing the questionnaire. Without their efforts, the project would not have been possible. These representatives include: Preston Johnson, Special Assistant to the Chairman, Employment Security Commission; Donald Brande, Director, Bureau of Employment Security Research; Ron Loftin, Assistant Chief for Operations, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Jim Stephens, Chief, Continuing Education and Staff Development, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; John Jarema, Education Specialist, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Grady Galloway, Special Assistant, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Loretta Michael, Specialist for Placement and Affirmative Action, Vocational Rehabilitation Services; Alan Alexander, Title I Balance-of-State Planner, Division of Community Development; and many local agency personnel across the state too numerous to mention.

Beyond these debts incurred by and discharged in friendly cooperation, we owe a great deal to those many individuals who spent precious time to respond to our many questions. We are indeed particularly grateful too, for the interest that Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. has shown in this study.

* * * * *

It goes without saying that this volume is about work. It is upon the work of average people that the good life must be founded. The day's work and the distribution of its products furnish the meeting place for economics, politics, and ethics. In this study can be found data that impinge upon all North Carolinians. The physical frontier for the Daniel Boones is gone, yet every worker with the desire to acquire the comforts of the world hears again and again the alluring voice that came to Kipling's explorer, "Something lost behind the Ranges. Lost and waiting for you. Go!"

Labor market information systems are frequently bewildering to career-choosers and job-seekers. The purpose of this research study is to begin the development of a Multi-purpose Occupational Information system that will enable each individual to have the chance to possess those good things that fate still obstinately withholds.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study provides the basis for a practical beginning by North Carolina state agencies to define and detail the shape of a Multi-Purpose Occupational Information System. This report is the result of a statewide assessment of user need and data availability for labor market information. It is a first step toward the accomplishment of the goal of condensing the large number of possible data elements into a reasonable working number which can be organized into an effective labor market occupational information system.

It is desirable to emphasize the fact that state agencies need information for various different uses. Within agencies the uses vary between the state level and local level program operation needs. Information which is used locally on a daily basis by one agency in its daily operation, may only be needed at the state level quarterly by that agency, while its use by another state agency may well be on an annual basis for federal reporting.

All of this is reflected in the responses which were made to the questionnaire which was used in the effort to determine empirically the informational needs of the Department of Public Instruction, Division of Community Employment (CETA), the Employment Security Commission, and Vocational Rehabilitation Services. Detailed reporting of all these responses is presented on pages 30-180 in this report. These responses make it possible to prioritize twenty-four data categories according to their relative importance to the above agencies at the state and local level. These twenty-four data categories covered various demand, supply, and related categories of labor market information.

There follows a summary of the findings for each of the twenty-four Generalized Data Categories that made up the Occupational Information Needs Assessment Questionnaire (see Appendix A-pp. 212-261).

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 1. - Characteristics of workers customarily hired. (Traits and Qualities Generally Associated with Employee Acceptance)

1) Officials at the State and local levels of four of the five State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 1 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance" for use in accomplishing seven functions necessary for their agency operations. (p.30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 1 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the second most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) Approximately one half of the respondents rated the available data for Category 1 as being adequate and one half of the respondents rated the available data as inadequate. This should be further analyzed and evaluated to determine whether or not efforts should be undertaken to improve the adequacy of the information. (See Analysis 2, p. 32)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the five state agencies for Category 1, "Characteristics of Workers Customarily Hired", there were eight items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By Current Estimates, By State, By Industry, By Occupation, By Long-Term Projections,By Occupational Cluster, By County, and By Short-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified seven items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following seven levels of specificity (listed in descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Industry, By County, By Occupational Cluster, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, and By State. Local level agency respondents also identified two levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Employer and By Short-Term Projection. (p.33)

5) All five State agencies rated Age, Sex, Race, and Physically Handicapped as needed descriptors for Category 1; also, three or more State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: Mentally Retarded, Education Level, Labor Force Participation Status, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five descriptors: Education Level, Sex, Physicaly Handicapped, Age, and Race. Local level agency respondents also identified one descriptor that was rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. It is: By Labor Force Participation Status. (p.34-35)

6) At the State level, Vocational Rehabilitation stated there was need for weekly updating of Category 1, while Public Instruction and Community Colleges rated annual updating as being adequate. Local level agency responses tended to request monthly or quarterly updating. (Analysis 5, p.36)

7) There is daily and weekly use made of the specific data elements in Category 1 by Employment Security and CETA. The educational institutions tend to make use of this data monthly and quarterly at the local level. (Analysis 6, p.36)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 1 are that all eight specific data elements listed, with the exception of "Interest Patterns", were rated by 80 percent or more of either State or local agency respondents as being needed. (p.37)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 1 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 1 - Characteristics of Workers Customarily Hired" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 2. - Characteristics of 'typical' job. (Usual work performed in selected occupations)

1) Officials at the State level of four of the five State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 2 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance" for use in accomplishing functions necessary for their agency operations. The responses at the local level from four out of five agencies agreed with this State level rating. (p.30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 2 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the fourth most needed. (p.31)

3) Slightly over one half of the respondents rated the available data for Category 2 as being inadequate. This should be further evaluated. (See Analysis 2, p. 38)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 2, "Characteristics of 'typical' job", there were eight items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating)

11

were: By State, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By Occupation, By County, and By Short-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified six items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following six levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By County, By Current Estimates, and By State. Also, local level agency respondents identified four levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Employer, By Multi-County Planning Region, By Short-Term Projections, and by Long-Term Projections. (p.39)

5) Three or more State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: By Sex, By Age, By Race, By Education Level, By Mentally Retarded, By Physically Handicapped, By Offender Status, and By Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five descriptors: By Education Level, By Age, By Physically Handicapped, By Sex, and By Race. Local level agency respondents also identified the descriptor By Labor Force Participation Status as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. (p. 40-41)

6) At the State level, three agencies indicated need for annual updating of data elements in Category 2, while Employment Security and CETA found monthly or quarterly updating needed. Local level agency responses tended to parallel state level responses in this case. (Analysis 5, p. 42)

7) There is no clustering of responses that would indicate any common frequency of use of the data elements in Category 2. (Analysis 6, p. 42)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 2 are that all twelve specific data elements are rated by 55% or more of State and local agency respondents as being needed. (p. 43)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 2 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 2 - Characteristics of 'Typical' Job" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 3. - Employment patterns. (Information generally descriptive of employer hiring practices)

1) Officials at the State and local levels of four State agencies rated the five specific data elements of Category 3 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance" for use in accomplishing the functions necessary for their agency operations. (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 3 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most important. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the third most needed. (p. 31)

3) Approximately one half of the state and local agency respondents rated the available data as being "Adequate" - The rest stating the data was "Inadequate". This should be further analyzed and evaluated to determine what need there is to improve the adequacy of the information. (See Analysis 2, p. 44)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 3, "Employment Patterns," there were seven items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These seven levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, By Occupation, By County, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified eight items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Industry, By Employer, By County, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, By Multi-County Planning Region, and By Occupational Cluster. Also, local level agency respondents identified two additional levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: By State and By Short-Term Projections. (p. 45)

5) There were three State agencies that rated Age, Sex, Race, By Mentally Retarded, and By Physically Handicapped as needed descriptors for Category 3. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five descriptors: By Age, By Education Level, By Sex, By Race, and By Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents also identified By Veteran Status as being a descriptor that was rated as needed by more than 50% of those responding from three agencies. (pp. 46-47)

6) At the State level, four of the five agencies indicate a need for annual updating of the data elements relating to "Employment Patterns". Local level agency responses called mainly for annual updating, with significant support also expressed for quarterly and monthly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 48)

7) There is extremely wide variation in the frequency of use of Category 3. (Analysis 6, p. 48)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 3 are that all five of the specific data elements listed, with the exception of "Temporary/permanent", were rated by 80 percent or more of both State and local agency respondents as being needed. (p. 49)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 3 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 3 - Employment Patterns" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 4. - Turnover statistics.

1) At the State level, four out of five State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 4 as being of "Critical Importance" for agency operations. The responses from four out of five agencies at the local level rated Category 4 as being of "Above Average Importance." (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 4 tied for first place with six other data categories. At the local level, agency responses ranked it as being the twelfth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) Approximately one half of the State and local level respondents rated the available data for Category 4 as being adequate and one half of the respondents rated the available data as inadequate. (See Analysis 2, p. 50)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 4, "Turnover Statistics", there were five items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By Current Estimates,

By State, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster and By Occupation. Local level agency respondents identified four items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Industry, By County, By Occupation and By Long-Term Projections. Additionally, local level agency respondents identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or four agencies. They are: By Employer, By Current Estimates and By Occupational Cluster. (p. 51)

5) There were four State agencies that rated By Age, By Sex, and By Race as needed descriptors for Category 4; also three State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: By Education Level, By Mentally Retarded, and By Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents identified two descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following two descriptors: By Age and By Sex. Local level agency respondents also identified four descriptors that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or four agencies. They are: By Education Level, By Race, By Physically Handicapped, and By Veteran Status. (pp. 52-53)

6) At the State level, Employment Security stated there was need for monthly updating of Category 4, while CETA and Vocational Rehabilitation rated quarterly updating as being desired. Public Instruction and Community Colleges rated annual updating as being adequate. Local level agency responses called for updating Category 4 quarterly, with annual updating rated a close second, followed by monthly updating as the third desired choice. (Analysis 5, p. 54)

7) There is no common practice in frequency of use of the data in Category 4 at eigher the State or local level. No conclusions can be elicited. (p. 54)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 4 are that all seven specific data elements listed were rated by 60% or more of State agency respondents as being needed. Five of the seven data elements were rated by 50% or more of the local agency respondents as being needed. (p. 55)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 4 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 4 - Turnover Statistics" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected

Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 5. - Total employment.

1) Three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 5 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance" for use in accomplishing the functions necessary for their agency operations. At the State level, the remaining two State agencies rated Category 5 as of "Above Average Importance"; the responses at the local level from three out of five agencies agreed with this rating. (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 5 tied for eighth place with five other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the seventh most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three of the five agencies rated the available data for Category 5 as being inadequate, while the other two agencies rated it as being adequate. At the local level, about 4/7 of the responses rated the available data as adequate. (p. 56)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 5, "Total Employment", there were eight items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupation, By Long-Term Projections, By Occupational Cluster, By County, and By Short-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified six items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following six levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By Occupation, By County, By Long-Term Projections, and By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents also identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or four agencies. They were: By Employer, By State, and By Short-Term Projections. (p. 57)

5) All five State agencies rated Age, Sex, Race, and Physically Handicapped as needed descriptors for Category 5; also, three

State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: Education Level, Mentally Retarded, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, and Education Level. Local level agency respondents also identified four descriptors that are needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Physically Handicapped, By Head of Household, By Female Head of Household, and By Veteran Status. (pp. 58-59)

6) At the State level, Employment Security and CETA stated there was need for monthly updating of data on Category 5, while Public Instruction, Community Colleges, and Vocational Rehabilitation rated annual updating of the data as being adequate. Local level agency responses tended to rate annual or quarterly updating as the frequency to be required. (Analysis 5, p. 60)

7) There is wide disparity in frequency of use of total employment data at the State level, with CETA and VR using it weekly, and Public Instruction and Community Colleges using it annually. There is at the local level a frequency of use annually and monthly. (p. 60)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 5 are that the data elements "Number employed" is needed by all State and local agencies, while the data element "Employment rate" is much more needed at the local agency level than at the State level. (p. 61)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 5 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 5 - Total Employment" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 6. - Job openings. (vacancies)

1) Officials at both the State and local levels of four of the five State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 6 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 6 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being in first place as being the most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, only Public Instruction rated the available data for Category 6 as being adequate; the other four State agencies rated the available information as not adequate. One half of the local level agency respondents rated the available data as being not adequate and the other half of the respondents rated the available data as adequate. Efforts should be undertaken to improve the adequacy of the information. (Analysis 2, p. 62)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the five State agencies for Category 6, "Job Openings (Vacancies)", there were eight items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By Occupation, By State, By Current Estimate, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By County, By Short-Term Projections, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified eight items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By County, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, By Employer, and By Multi-County Planning Region. Local level agency respondents also identified one descriptor that was rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. It is: By Short-Term Projections. (p. 63)

5) Four State agencies rated Age, Sex, and Race as needed descriptors for Category 6; also, three State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: Education Level, Mentally Retarded, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents identified one descriptor that was needed by at least 64% of those responding from three State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the descriptor - Education Level. Local level agency respondents also identified one descriptor that was rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. It is: Physically Handicapped. (pp. 64-65)

6) At the State level, two agencies stated there was need for annual updating of "Category 6 - Job Openings", while VR rated weekly updating as preferred. Employment Security required monthly and CETA required quarterly updating. Local level agency responses (apart from PI) tended rather

evenly to divide among quarterly, monthly, weekly, or daily updating. (Analysis 5, p. 66)

7) At the State level, two agencies stated there was a daily use of the specific data elements in Category 6. Employment Security made monthly, Community Colleges made quarterly, and Public Instruction made annual use of the data on "Job Openings". Local level agency respondents revealed there is no concurrence on the frequency of use of this category of data. (Analysis 6, p.66)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 6 are that all five specific data elements are needed by 60% or more of both State and local agency respondents. (p. 67)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 6 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 6 - Job Openings (Vacancies)" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 7. - Employment requirements.

1) At the State level, four State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 7 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance". Local level agency respondents from two State agencies concurred with this judgment; however, local respondents from the remaining three State agencies evaluated Category 7 as being of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 7 was in fifteenth place. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the fifth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, four State agencies rated the available information as not adequate. Approximately 4/7 of the local level agency respondents rated the available data as being adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 62)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the five State agencies for Category 7, "Employment Requirements", there were seven items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These seven levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State,

By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By Occupation, By Short-Term Projections, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified five items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Industry, By Occupation, By County, By Long-Term Projections, and By Occupational Cluster. Local level agency respondents also identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from four or five agencies. They are: By Employer, By Current Estimate, and By Short-Term Projections.

5) Three State agencies rated Age, Sex, and Race as needed descriptors for Category 7. Local level agency respondents identified Age as a descriptor that is needed by at least 64% of those responding from three State agencies. Local level agency respondents also identified four descriptors that are rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: Education Level, Sex, Race, and Physically Handicapped. (pp. 70-71)

6) At the State level, three agencies stated there was need for annual updating of "Employment Requirements". Local level agency responses primarily supported annual or quarterly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 72)

7) At the State level, CETA and VR make monthly use of Category 7, while Employment Security and Public Instruction report an annual frequency of use of Category 7. Local level agency responses are divided rather evenly in support of various alternative frequencies of use. (Analysis 6, p. 72)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 7 are that the two specific data elements are rated by 91% or more of both State and local agency respondents as being needed. (p. 73)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 7 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 7 - Employment Requirements" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 8. - Unemployment statistics.

1) At the State level, three State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 8 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance". Local level agency respondents for two State agencies concurred with this judgment. The remaining State and local level agency respondents evaluated Category 8 as being of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 8 tied for eighth place with four other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the tenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, four State agencies rated the available information as not adequate. Approximately 4/7 of the local level agency respondents rated the available data as being adequate. (p. 74)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 8, "Unemployment Statistics", there were seven items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These seven levels or specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By County, By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified seven items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following seven levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Industry, By County, By Occupation, By Current Estimates, By Occupational Cluster, By Long-Term Projections, and By Multi-County Planning Region. Local level agency respondents also identified two levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By State and By Employer. (p. 75)

5) At the State level, three or more State agencies rated the following eight descriptors as needed: Age, Sex, Race, Offender Status, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Head of Household, and Female Head of Household. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Education Level, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents also identified Veteran Status as a descriptor that was rated as needed by more than 50% responding from three agencies. (pp. 76-77)

6) At the State level, Employment Security requires weekly updating of unemployment statistics, which is more frequent

than is required by other State agencies. Local level agency responses tend to request monthly updates of data, while Public Instruction has an annual requirement for updating. (Analysis 5, p. 78)

7) There is daily use made of the specific data elements in Category 8 by Employment Security and CETA. Vocational Rehabilitation and Public Instruction make monthly use of the data, while Community Colleges use it quarterly. Local level agency responses tend to report a monthly use of the data in the category. (Analysis 6, p. 78)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 8 are that the two specific data elements listed were rated by 80 % or more of both State and local agency respondents as being needed. (p. 79)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 8 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 8 - Unemployment Statistics" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 9. - Labor force statistics.

1) Officials at the State level of three State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 9 as of "Critical Importance". The local level respondents of two agencies concurred with this rating. With the exception of Vocational Rehabilitation, the remaining state and local respondents classified "Labor force statistics" as being of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 9 tied for sixteenth place with three other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the thirteenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, respondents rated the available data for Category 9 as being not adequate. The majority of the local level respondents rated the available data as adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 80)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 9, "Labor force statistics",

there were six items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These six levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, By SMSA, By Multi-County Planning Region, and By County. Local level agency respondents identified eight items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following eight levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By County, By Occupation, By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By Long-Term Projections, By Short-Term Projections, and By Multi-County Planning Region. Local level agency respondents also identified By State as a level of specificity that was rated as needed by over 50% of those responding from three agencies. (p. 81)

5) Three or more State agencies rated the following as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, and Head of Household. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Sex, Age, Race, and Education Level. Local level agency respondents also identified four descriptors that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: Physically Handicapped, Veteran Status, Head of Household, and Female Head of Household. (pp. 82-83)

6) At the State level, Employment Security requires monthly updating of "Labor Force Statistics". Other state agencies require quarterly and annual updating. Local level agency responses in general duplicated the state level responses. (Analysis 5, p. 84)

7) There is a wide and rather even dispersion of responses indicating that weekly, monthly, and quarterly use is made of "Labor Force Statistics". (Note: no emphasis is placed on the annual use that is reported, because if "Labor Force Statistics" are available for use monthly this meets annual needs.) (Analysis 6, p. 84)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 9 are that 60% or more of both state and local respondents need the two specific data elements listed.

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 9 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 9 - Labor Force Statistics" - should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 10. - Characteristics of employed. (Demographic characteristics of present labor force)

1) Officials at the State level of two State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 10 as of "Critical Importance". Employment Security and Vocational Rehabilitation at the State level rated it as "Average Importance". At the local level, respondents from all five State agencies rated Category 10 as of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 10 was ranked twentieth. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being seventeenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) The majority of both state level and local responses rated the available data for Category 10 as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 86)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the five State agencies for Category 10, "Characteristics of Employed", there were five items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, By County, By SMSA, and By Multi-County Planning Region. Local level agency respondents identified five items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By County, By Industry, By Current Estimates, and By Occupational Cluster. Local level agency respondents also identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Employer, By State, and By Long-Term Projections. (p. 87)

5) Three or more State agencies rated Race, Age, Sex, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Emotionally Disturbed, and Education Level as needed descriptors for Category 10. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following

five descriptors: Age, Education Level, Sex, Race, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents also identified Veteran Status as a descriptor that was rated as needed by over 50% of those responding from three agencies. (pp. 88-89)

6) At the State level, the Employment Security rating for frequency of required updating of "Characteristics of Employed" is weekly. CETA and Public Instruction list quarterly as the required currency of the category, while Community Colleges and Vocational Rehabilitation require annual updating. Local level agency responses divided in general among monthly, quarterly, and annually. (Analysis 5, p. 90)

7) There is very little congruence in the ratings of required frequency of use of Category 10 at either the state or local level. (p. 90)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 10 are that seven of the nine specific data elements are needed by either four or five State agencies at the State level. Five of the nine items were rated as needed by 80% of respondents from the local level. (p. 91)

Summary: Given the responses showing little need for the data and the low ratings found for Category 10 in the North Carolina survey, the record indicates that "Category 10 - Characteristics of Employed" - should probably not be included in the projected Occupational Information System, but the final decision should be made by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 11. - Characteristics of unemployed.

1) Officials of three State agencies rated the specific data elements of Category 11 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance". Local level agency respondents from four state agencies rated Category 11 as being of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In both the state and local level of ranking of category need across agencies, Category 11 was in sixteenth place. (p. 31)

3) At both the State and local level, responses were evenly divided between those rating the available data for Category

11 as adequate and those rating the data as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 92)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 11, "Characteristics of Unemployed", there were seven items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These seven levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, By Occupation, By SMSA, and By County. Local level agency respondents identified five items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By County, By Occupation, By Industry, By Current Estimates, and By Occupational Cluster. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By State, By Employer, and By Short-Term Projections. (p. 93)

5) At the State level three or more State agencies rated the following six items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, and Head of Household. Local level agency respondents identified six descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following six descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Education Level, Physically Handicapped, and Veteran Status. Local level agency respondents also identified two descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: Head of Household and Female Head of Household. (pp. 94-95)

6) At the State level, Employment Security rated "Characteristics of Unemployed" as requiring monthly updating, while education agencies required annual updating, and CETA required updating monthly. Local level agency responses tended to require monthly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 96)

7) There is at the State level no agreement on a rating of required frequency of use of Category 11. Local level agency responses divided rather evenly in rating various alternative frequency of use of the data. (Analysis 6, p. 96)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 11 are that the ten specific data elements varied greatly in the degree that they are needed, with the local agencies having a higher need rating for this data then is revealed by the State level agency responses. (p. 97)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 11 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 11 - Characteristics of Unemployed" - should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 12. - Characteristics of discouraged workers. (Those who are not actively seeking work because they believe they would not find employment)

1) Officials at the State levels of CETA and Public Instruction rated the specific data elements of Category 12 as specially needed by being of "Critical Importance". VR rated it as of "Average Importance", while Community Colleges rated Category 12 as of "Above Average Importance". Local level agency responses rated "Characteristics of discouraged workers" as of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 12 was ranked in twenty-first place. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being nineteenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At both the State and local levels, agency officials for the most part rated the available data for Category 12 as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 98)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 12, "Characteristics of Discouraged Workers", there were three items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, and By Industry. Local level agency respondents identified three items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Current Estimates, and By County. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, and By State. (p. 99)

5) At the State level three or more State agencies rated the folloling seven items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Education Level, Mentally Retarded, Physically

27

Handicapped, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Education Level, Age, Sex, and Race. Local level agency respondents also identified four descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: Physically Handicapped, Veteran Status, Head of Household, and Female Head of Household. (pp. 100-101)

6) At the State level, three agencies responded that annual updating of Category 12 is required, while CETA stated there was need for quarterly updating. Local level agency responses divided in general among annually, monthly, and quarterly. (Analysis 5, p. 102)

7) CETA at the State level reports weekly use of the specific data items in Category 12. PI and CC use it annually, and VR uses it quarterly. Local level agency responses divided rather sharply between annually and monthly. (Analysis 6, p. 102)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 12 are that the eight specific data elements are needed substantially more by the local agencies than by the State level program operations. Five of the eight specific data elements are rated as needed by 62% or more of local level agency respondents. (p. 103)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 12 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation the "Category 12 - Characteristics of Discouraged Workers" - should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 13. - Characteristics of underemployed. (Standard CETA definition)

1) At the State level, CETA rated the specific data elements of Category 13 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance", while VR and PI rated it as of "Average Importance". Local level agency responses from four agencies rated "Characteristics of Underemployed" as being of "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 13 was ranked in twenty-second place. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the twentieth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At both the State and local levels, agency responses generally rate the available data for Category 13 as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 104)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 13, "Characteristics of Underemployed", there were three items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Occupation, and By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents identified three items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Occupation, By Current Estimates, and by County. Also, local level agency respondents identified two levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Industry and By Occupational Cluster. (p. 105)

5) At the State level three or more State agencies rated the following seven items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Education Level, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified five descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following five descriptors: Education Level, Income Level, Age, Sex, and Race. Local level agency respondents also identified the descriptor, Physically Handicapped as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. (pp. 106-107)

6) At the State level, PI, CC, and VR required annual updating of Category 13, while CETA stated there was need for quarterly updating. Local level agency responses tended to emphasize a more frequent updating that would be quarterly or monthly. (Analysis 5, p. 108)

7) There is weekly use of Category 13 at the State level by CETA, while VR and CC make quarterly use of the data. There tends to be a rather even division of local agency responses reporting annually, quarterly, and monthly use of the data. (Analysis 6, p. 108)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 13 are that there is substantial need for the two specific data

elements by both State and local agency officials. (p.109)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 13 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 13 - Characteristics of Underemployed" - should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 14. - Identification of employers. (establishment name, address)

1) Officials of four State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 14 as especially needed by being of "Critical Importance". Local level agency responses in general rated Category 14 as "Above Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 14 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the fifteenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three agencies rated the available data on "Identification of Employers" as adequate. A majority of local level responses rated the data as adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 110)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 14, "Identification of Employers", there were three items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Employer, and By Industry. Local level agency respondents identified three items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By County, By Industry, and By Occupation. Also, local level agency respondents identified two levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: By Employer and By Current Estimates. (p. 111)

5) Neither State nor local agencies indicated any substantial need for the descriptors. (pp. 112-113)

6) At the State level, three agencies required annual updating. Local level agency respondents in general recommended quarterly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 114)

7) CETA and VR at the State level report weekly use of Category 14, while Employment Security and Community Colleges make quarterly use of the data. Local level agency respondents in general report annual use. (Analysis 6, p. 114)

8) There is a wide range of spacific data elements identified and suggested in the State and local responses. (See p. 179)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 14 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 14 - Identification of Employers" - should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 15. - Characteristics of military returnees.

1) Officials of two State agencies at the State level rated Category 15 as being of "Above Average Importance". The remaining three State agencies did not rate this category at all. Local level agency respondents rated it as of "Average Importance". (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 15 was ranked in last place. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the twenty-third most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At both the State and local level, agency officials for the most part rate the available data for Category 15 as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 116)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 15, "Characteristics of Military Returnees", neither the State nor the local agency respondents indicated any substantial need for this information. (p. 117)

5) At the State level, there were no State agencies that rated any of the descriptors as being needed with the exception of the Community Colleges. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from four agencies. They are: Age, Sex, Race, and Education Level. (pp. 118-119)

6) At the State level, only two agencies indicated interest in updating Category 15, "Characteristics of Military Returnees", Employment Security requires monthly updating and Community Colleges require annual updating. The largest part of local agency respondents expressed no preference; the remaining local agency respondents divided between monthly and quarterly frequency of updating. (Analysis 5, p. 120)

7) At the State level, three agencies provided no response; Employment Security listed annually as the frequency of use of Category 15, while Community Colleges states a requirement for quarterly use. The bulk of local agency respondents expressed no view; the remaining local level agency respondents generally divided between quarterly and monthly as the frequency of use of the category. (Analysis 6, p.120)

8) The Findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 15 indicate small State level agency use for the specific data elements and somewhat more substantial local level use of the data in this category. (p. 121)

Summary: Given the responses showing little need for the data and the low ratings found for Category 15 in the North Carolina survey, the record indicates that "Category 15 - Characteristics of Military Returnees -" should probably not be included in the projected Occupational Information System, but the final decision should be made by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 16. - Number of completers/leavers by education and training programs.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 16 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency respondents from five State agencies rated Category 16 as at least of "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 11 was tied for sixteenth place with three other categories. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the ninth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three State agencies rated the available data for Category 16 as not adequate. Local level agency respondents were evenly divided between rating the available data as not adequate and as adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 122)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 16, there were three items that were needed by four State agencies. These three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) were: By State, By Current Estimates, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified two items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following two levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By County and By Current Estimates. Also, local level agency respondents identified By Long-Term Projections as a level of specificity that was rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. (p. 123)

5) At the State level three State agencies rated the following five items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Education Level, Race, Age, and Sex. Local level agency respondents also identified two descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are Physically Handicapped, and Head of Household.

6) At the State level, three State agencies stated there was need for annual updating of Category 16, and the preponderance of local agency responses recommended annual updating. (Analysis 5, p. 126)

7) Three State agencies and the majority of local agency respondents indicated that Category 16 data was used annually. (Analysis 6, p. 126)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 16 are that the fifteen specific data elements are used by three

or more State agencies at the State level and that there is substantial local level agency use of this data. (p. 127)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 16 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 16 - Number of Completers/ Leavers by Education and Training Programs" - should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 17. - Characteristics of completers/ leavers by education and training programs.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 17 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency responses from four agencies rated Category 17 as being of at least "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the State level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 17 tied for sixteenth place with three other data categories. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the fourteenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three State agencies rated the available data for Category 17 as not adequate. The majority of local level agency respondents rated the available data as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 128)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 17, there are four items that are needed by three or more State agencies. They are: By Current Estimates, By State, By Occupational Cluster, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified one item that was needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following level of specificity: By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents identified two levels of specificity that are rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: By State and By County. (p. 129)

5) At the State level, three State agencies rated the following five items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user needs, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, and Education Level. Local level agency respondents also identified two descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: Physically Handicapped and Head of Household. (pp. 130-131)

6) At the State level, three agencies required annual updating of Category 17. A preponderance of local level agency respondents required annual updating. (Analysis 5, p. 132)

7) At the State level, there is annual use of the data in Category 17 by Public Instruction and Employment Security, while CETA makes weekly and Community Colleges make monthly use of the data. The majority of local level agency respondents indicate annual use is made of this data category. (Analysis 6, p. 132)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 17 are that at the State level three or more State agencies make use of the five specific data items and 80% of the local level agency respondents make use of the data. (p. 133)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 17 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 17 - Characteristics of Completers/Leavers by Education and Training Programs" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 18. - Number of enrollees by education and training programs.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 18 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency respondents rated Category 18 as being somewhat better than "average importance." (p. 30)

35

2) In the State level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 18 tied for eighth place with two other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the eighteenth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the local level, four State agencies rated the available data for Category 18 as not adequate. Local level agency respondents divided evenly between rating the available data as adequate and not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 124)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 18, there were six items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These six levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) are: By State, By Current Estimates, By Long-Term Projections, By Occupational Cluster, By County, and By Short-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified By County as a level of specificity that was needed by 64% or more of those responding from four State agencies. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Occupation, By Current Estimates, and By State. (p. 135)

5) Three or more State agencies rated the following eight items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Education Level, Offender Status, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Race, Sex, Age, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents also identified Education Level as a descriptor needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. (pp. 136-137)

6) At the State level, four agencies required annual updating of Category 18. A preponderance of local level agency respondents required annual updating. (Analysis 5, p.138)

7) At the State level, three agencies make quarterly use of the data in Category 18. Local level agency respondents in general reported frequency of use of the information in Category 18 as being annual, quarterly, and monthly. (Analysis 6, p. 138)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 18 reveal wide use of the fifteen specific data elements in Category 18 at both State and local level. (p. 139)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 18 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 18 - Number of Enrollees by Education and Training Programs" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 19. - Occupational mobility. (Movement within occupation not due to geographic migration)

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 19 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency respondents rated Category 19 as somewhat better than "average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the State level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 19 was tied for thirteenth place. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the twenty-first most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, four agencies rated the available data for "Occupational Mobility" as not adequate. Local level agency respondents divided evenly between adequate and not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 140)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 19, there were five items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These five levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) are: By State, By Current Estimates, By Industry, By Occupational Cluster, and By County. Local level agency respondents identified By Occupation as a level of specificity that was needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By County, By Current Estimates, and By Industry. (p. 141)

5) At the State level, three or more State agencies rated the following seven items as needed descriptors for "Occupational Mobility": Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Age, Education Level, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors as being needed by 50% or more

of those responding from three agencies. They are: Age, Sex, Race, and Education level. (pp. 142-143)

6) At the State level, three agencies stated there was need for annual updating of the data on "Occupational Mobility", while Employment Security indicated monthly updating was required. In the main, local level agency respondents divided among the alternatives of annual, quarterly, or monthly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 144)

7) There is wide variation at the State level in frequency of use of the data in Category 19. Local level agency respondents reported use of the information primarily on an annual or quarterly basis. (Analysis 6, p. 144)

8) At the State level all five agencies need the specific data elements in Category 19, while 76% of the local level agency respondents also indicate use is made of the data. (p. 145)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 19 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that"Category 19 - Occupational Mobility" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 20. - Population characteristics.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 20 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency responses from three agencies rated Category 20 as of "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 20 tied for eighth place with four other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the twenty-second most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three agencies rated the available data on "Population Characteristics" as not adequate. Approximately one half of the local level agency respondents rated the available data on Category 20 as not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 146)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 20, there were three items that were needed by four State agencies. These three levels of specificity are: By State, By Current Estimates, and By Long-Term Projections. Local level agency respondents identified four items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By County, By Current Estimates, By Short-Term Projections, and By Long-Term Projections. Also, local level agency respondents identified By State as a descriptor rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. (p. 147)

5) At the State level State agencies rated the following ten items as needed descriptors: Age, Sex, Race, Mentally Retarded, Physically Handicapped, Education Level, Labor Force Participation Status, Head of Household, and Emotionally Disturbed. Local level agency respondents identified four descriptors that were needed by at least 64% of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four descriptors: Sex, Race, Age, and Ecucation Level. Local level agency respondents also identified three descriptors as being needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: Physically Handicapped, Head of Household, and Female Head of Household. (pp. 148-149)

6) At the State level, four agencies stated there was need for annual updating of the data in Category 20. Local level agency respondents preponderantly required annual updating. (Analysis 5, p. 150)

7) At the State level, there is monthly use of Category 20 by Employment Security, while Public Instruction and Vocational Rehabilitation make annual use of this information. Local level agency respondents preponderantly report annual use of Category 20. (Analysis 6, p. 150)

8) Five of the ten specific data elements in Category 20 are used by only one agency at the State level. At the local level 45% or more of the respondents reported need for five of the data elements. (p. 151)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 20 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Category 20 - Population Characteristics" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 21. - Economic indicators.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 21 as especially needed by being of "critical importance", while the remaining two State agencies rated it as of "above average importance." Local level agency respondents from four State agencies also rated it as being of better than "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 21 tied for eighth place with four other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the eleventh most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p.31)

3) At the State level, three State agencies rated the available data for Category 21 as adequate, while two State agencies rated the data as not adequate. Local level agency respondents divided evenly half and half in support of these differing evaluations. (Analysis 2, p. 152)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 1, "Economic Indicators", there were three items that were needed by four State agencies. They are: By Industry, By State, and By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents identified four items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following four levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Industry, By County, By Current Estimates, and By Long-Term Projections. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels of specificity that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. They are: By Occupation, By State, and By Short-Term Projections. (p. 153)

5) Neither State nor local agencies rated the descriptors as being needed in any important way. (pp. 154-155)

6) At the State level, Employment Security required monthly updating of the data involved in "Economic Indicators", while the education agencies required annual updating and both CETA and VR required quarterly updating. Local level agency respondents divided somewhat evenly among these three alternative frequencies of updating. (Analysis 5, p. 156)

7) There is at the State level annual use made of Category 21 by Public Instruction and Community Colleges. Employment Security and Vocational Rehabilitation make monthly use of the data in "Economic Indicators." Local level agency respondents divide somewhat evenly among annual, quarterly, and monthly frequency of use of this information. (Analysis 6, p. 156)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 21 reveal there is a very wide need by both State and local level agency respondents for the specific data elements in Category 21. (p. 157)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 21 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the recommendation that "Economic Indicators" should be carefully considered for possible inclusion in the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 22. - Fiscal information.

1) Officials of two State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 22 as of "above average importance", while CETA rated this data category as of "below average importance", and two State agencies rated it as of "no importance." Local level agency respondents from three State agencies rated Category 22 as of "below average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the state level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 22 placed twenty-third. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the twenty-fourth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, Public Instruction and Community Colleges rate the available data for Category 22 as being adequate, while CETA rates it as being not adequate. A preponderance of local level agency respondents rate the available data as adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 158)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 22, there are two items that were needed by three State agencies. These two levels of specificity are: By State and By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents did not report any important need for data specificity. (p. 159)

5) Neither State nor local agency respondents stated there was any substantial need for the descriptors for data Category 22. (pp. 160-161)

6) At the State level, Public Instruction and Community Colleges reported a requirement for annual updating of Category 22. Local level agency respondents tended to require annual updating. (Analysis 5, p. 162)

7) At the State level, Public Instruction and Community Colleges make annual use of "Fiscal Information", while CETA makes quarterly use of this data category. Local level agency respondents in the main report annual use of this information. (Analysis 6, p. 162)

8) Analysis 7 of Category 22 reveals that there is small scattered use of the specific data elements in Category 22. (p. 163)

Summary: Given the responses showing little need for the data and the low ratings found for Category 22 in the North Carolina survey, the record indicates that "Category 22 - Fiscal Information" should probably not be included in the projected Occupational Information System, but the final decision should be made by the NCSOICC signatory members.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 23. - Education and training program characteristics.

1) Officials of three State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 23 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency respondents from five agencies rate Category 23 as being somewhat more than of "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the State level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 23 tied for thirteenth place as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the sixth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, four agencies reported that the available data on "Education and Training Program Characteristics" is not adequate. Public Instruction stated that the available data for this category is adequate. Local

level agency respondents divided rather evenly between reporting either that the available data is adequate or that it is not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 164)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 23, there are two items that were needed by four or more State agencies. These two levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating) are: By State and By Current Estimates. Local level agency respondents identified By County as an item that is needed by 64% or more of those responding from four State agencies. Also, local level agency respondents identified three levels of specificity that were rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three agencies. They are: By Current Estimates, By State, and By Occupation. (p. 165)

5) At the State level, three State agencies rated the following six items as needed descriptors for "Education and Training Program Characteristics." They are: Age, Sex, Race, Ecucation Level, Mentally Retarded, and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents did not report any descriptor as having the defined level of use that secures listing in this summary. (pp.166-167)

6) At the State level, three State agencies reported a requirement for annual updating of Category 23. Employment Security reports a requirement for monthly updating, while CETA reports need for quarterly updating. The preponderance of local level agency respondents require annual updating, while a significant proportion of other respondents require monthly or quarterly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 168)

7) At the State level, Employment Security makes daily use of the data in Category 23, and CETA makes quarterly use of this information. The remaining three State agencies make annual use of Category 23. Local level agency respondents divided rather evenly in reporting annual (most often reported), quarterly, and monthly use of Category 23.

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 23 reveal that at the State level and the local level there is very extensive use made of the six specific data elements relating to "Education and Training Program Characteristics." (p. 169)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 23 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 23 - Education and Training Program Characteristics" should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

Generalized Data Category # 24. - Counseling and placement opportunities.

1) Officials of four State agencies at the State level rated the specific data elements of Category 24 as especially needed by being of "critical importance." Local level agency respondents from five agencies rate Category 24 as being somewhat more than of "above average importance." (p. 30)

2) In the State level ranking of category need across agencies, Category 24 tied for first place with six other data categories as being most needed. At the local level, agency officials ranked it as being the eighth most needed of the 24 Generalized Data Categories. (p. 31)

3) At the State level, three agencies stated that the available data on "counseling and placement opportunities" is not adequate, while Public Instruction and Employment Security reported that the available data is adequate. A slightly larger number of local level agency respondents stated that the available data is adequate as compared to the number of respondents reporting that the available data is not adequate. (Analysis 2, p. 170)

4) In identifying the levels of data specificity needed by the State agencies for Category 24, there are three items that were needed by three or more State agencies. These three levels of specificity are: By State, By Current Estimates, and By County. Local level agency respondents identified three items that were needed by 64% or more of those responding from three or more State agencies. A finding of this local level user need, as defined, is thus made for the following three levels of specificity (listed in a descending order of need rating): By Current Estimates, By County, and By State. Also, local level agency respondents identified By Occupation as a level of specificity that was rated as needed by 50% or more of those responding from three or more agencies. (p. 171)

5) At the State level, three State agencies rated the following two items as needed descriptors for "counseling and placement opportunities." They are: Mentally Retarded and Physically Handicapped. Local level agency respondents did not report any descriptors as having the defined level of use that secures listing in this summary. (pp. 172-173)

6) At the State level, three State agencies reported a requirement for annual updating of Category 24. Employment Security reports a requirement for monthly updating, while CETA reports need for quarterly updating. The largest part of local level agency respondents require annual updating, while a significant proportion of other respondents require monthly or quarterly updating. (Analysis 5, p. 174)

7) At the State level, three agencies make annual use of the data in Category 24, while Employment Security makes monthly and CETA makes quarterly use of this information. Local level agency respondents divided rather evenly in reporting annual (most often reported), monthly, and quarterly use of Category 24. (Analysis 6, p. 174)

8) The findings reported in Analysis 7 of Category 24 reveal that at the State level three or more of the State agencies use five of the specific data elements. There are 86% or more of the local level agency respondents reporting need for these five specific data elements. (p. 175)

Summary: Given the responses and ratings found for Category 24 in the North Carolina survey, the foregoing appraisal would lead one to the determination that "Category 24 - Counseling and Placement Opportunities" should be part of the projected Occupational Information System in North Carolina.

* * *

No summary is attempted at this point to report on the data holdings of the surveyed agencies in regard to labor market information in North Carolina. The report on findings about available labor market information matched to user needs is presented on pages 181-203 of this report.

An overall view of the generalized data categories shows the complexity of the differences of agency needs at the State and local levels. When the judgment of all agencies in appraising their data needs is examined, it becomes evident that with the exception of millage in category twenty-two, "Fiscal Information", all the data elements were needed by one or more agencies. Every category of data information was listed as rated at "Above average importance" by two or more State level agencies. While some categories clearly received lower ratings than other categories across the surveyed agencies, twenty-one categories received a rating of "Critical importance" from two or more State level agencies. Only thirteen of the one hundred and twenty State level judgments rated any of the data categories as "Below average importance" or of "No importance."

The concept of a shared information system implies and empirical information supports the contention that a wide range of data is important in order to serve the needs of all agencies sharing in the system.

A content analysis of agency comments on the adequacy of data reveals that the primary problem with data is that it is available but incomplete (n=64) (page 177). The second major problem cited is that information is not available (N=57).

A general appraisal of how well the information currently collected actually matches the need for such information would note that some information was available for nineteen of the twenty-four categories. Those categories for which information was not available include four categories which received the lowest priority ratings; joining this group is the category titled occupational mobility. The occupational mobility category ranked nineteenth in the priority ratings. The absence of data for which there was low need supports the conclusion that agencies generally do not collect low priority information.

Many caveats are in order regarding the extent of information available for the twenty-four data categories and the specific data elements. For example, the assessment of availability, like the needs assessment, covered only five agencies. Information defined as available is limited to the public sector, and in particular the agencies surveyed in this study. For instance, category seventeen shows information available on the number of completers and leavers of education and training programs who are employed. This does not include private schools, private employer training programs, and so forth. The relevant data availability is therefore limited by the scope of this study.

This Final Report will be distributed to the Signatory Committee members of the North Carolina SOICC and to the members of the Technical Advisory Committee. Using this Final Report as the basic starting point, discussion directed toward identifying what data to include in the common core of a multi-purpose occupational information system can begin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Authors' Abstract iii

Preface v

Acknowledgements vii

Executive Summary . . . . xi - xlviii

Section

I. Introduction 1

II. Methodology 14

III. Analysis of Agency Needs for Labor Market Information 20

Tables

1) Mean Importance Rating of Categories by Agency 30
2) Ranking of Category Need Across Agency . . . 31
3) Category 1 Analyses 32- 37
4) Category 2 Analyses 38- 43
5) Category 3 Analyses 44- 49
6) Category 4 Analyses 50- 55
7) Category 5 Analyses 56- 61
8) Category 6 Analyses 62- 67
9) Category 7 Analyses 68- 73
10) Category 8 Analyses 74- 79
11) Category 9 Analyses 80- 85
12) Category 10 Analyses 86- 91
13) Category 11 Analyses 92- 97
14) Category 12 Analyses 98-103
15) Category 13 Analyses 104-109
16) Category 14 Analyses 110-115
17) Category 15 Analyses 116-121
18) Category 16 Analyses 122-127
19) Category 17 Analyses 128-133
20) Category 18 Analyses 134-139
21) Category 19 Analyses 140-145
22) Category 20 Analyses 146-151
23) Category 21 Analyses 152-157
24) Category 22 Analyses 158-163
25) Category 23 Analyses 164-169
26) Category 24 Analyses 170-175
27) Other Category Uses Indicated by Agencies . . 176
28) State and Local Agencies Comments on Data Adequacy by Category 177
29) State and Local: Other Elements Needed by Agencies 178-180

IV. Available Labor Market Information Matched to Need 181

Tables

1) Table 1 - Source Documentation Form 185
2) Table 2 - Element Documentation Form for Aggregate Elements 187-188
3) Table 3 - Element Documentation Form for Unitary Elements 190
4) A Catalogue of Data Holdings by Category and Element Across Agencies 195-203

V. Analysis of Undocumented Agency Needs 204

1) Listing of Specific Data Elements by Category for Which No Information Was Documented During Data Availability Interviews . . 205

Results 206

Conclusions 207

Bibliography 209

APPENDIX A - Occupational Information Needs Assessment Questionnaire 212-261

APPENDIX B - Letters from Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. and Joyce Kinnison which accompanied the questionnaire 262-263

APPENDIX C - List of Data Categories and Data Elements 264-268

Section 1 - INTRODUCTION

This occupational information research was undertaken because of the need for and the importance of developing an occupational information system to support a coordinated inter-agency effort to improve the access of North Carolina citizens to training and employment opportunities.

An information needs assessment is the logical first step in the development of a multi-purpose occupational information system capable of providing for the policy planning needs of public and private administrators and the career decision needs of individuals.

In his letter of February 11, 1977 requesting USOE support for this research, Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. of North Carolina emphasized that, "A major focus of my administration is the integration of labor force development with economic growth. The development of an expanded Labor Market Information System will provide the citizens of North Carolina with greater access to employment opportunities while enhancing the State's economic potential."

The research project that was submitted to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education set forth a design for the assessment of user information needs and a review and analysis of the extent to which available data meet these needs leading to a conceptual framework for a multi-purpose occupational information system.

The project was funded by the U. S. Office of Education in the Spring of 1977 and the North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NCSOICC) was given the responsibility of directing and conducting this survey of user need and data availability.[1] The needs assessment is the first stage in the design and implementation of a state-wide multi-purpose Occupational Information System by the North Carolina SOICC.

The purpose of this investigation of data needs and data availability is to provide the basis for establishing a North Carolina multi-purpose occupational information system that will supply standardized data relating to jobs, educational opportunities, and manpower training programs.

The systematic identification of labor market information needs was first called for by Congress in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1968 which directed the Secretary of Labor to take steps to create a comprehensive labor market information system. With the passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, the production, dissemination, and use of labor market information took on a new urgency. Not only was the distribution of four billion dollars based directly on an analysis of labor conditions in locations across the United States, but also the Act introduced a new and important group of labor market information users. Before 1973, the labor market system was of concern to job seekers and state and Federal government agencies. After 1973, the system also became an urgent concern to city and county governments and other agencies operating at local levels. The information requirements of the CETA Act of 1973 made new efforts necessary to define the parameters of the labor market information program.

---

[1] This research project was funded by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of the U. S. Office of Education by USOE Grant Number: G00-77-02-137, (Project #498-AH-70-211) for the period September 1, 1977 to August 31, 1978

Section 312 (a) of the CETA Act of 1973 contains the following legislative mandate:

> The Secretary of Labor shall develop a comprehensive system of labor market information on a national, state, local or other appropriate basis which shall be made publicly available on a timely basis.

Despite this specific assignment of responsibility, it is not surprising that the efforts to develop a labor market information system are not regarded as comprehensive or successful. There are tens of millions of direct participants in the labor market (users), all searching for that ultimate position which will insure economic security and, as important as that, personal fulfillment. They face a vast set of decisions (uses) for in the United States there are more than 20,000 specific occupations to choose from. In addition, job seekers, employers, and educational institutions are constantly in search of better labor market information that they can trust to use in making prudent decisions.

It is useful to recall that the 1975 Manpower Report of the President recommended the rapid establishment of a comprehensive labor market information system and discussed the need for restructuring the current systen of occupational information in order to meet both legislative and manpower program requirements. In its first report issued in February 1975, the National Commission for Manpower Policy concluded that:

> The labor market and related information which is available for allocating funds, programming, and the general operation of manpower programs on a local basis is inadequate...A greatly expanded analytical and technical effort, supported by additional financial resources, is required if the Nation is to understand and improve the operation of its local labor markets.[2]

---

[2] National Commission for Manpower Policy, The Challenge of Rising Unemployment. Report No. 1 Washington, D. C., February 1975.

In taking action to enact the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), Congress revised and extended the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to make explicit its intention that there be established a results-oriented partnership between USOE Vocational Education and Labor Department-CETA funded human resource development efforts. One of the purposes of Federal aid to the states as specified in Title II of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 is:

> ...to assist States in improving planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training by involving a wide range of agencies and individuals concerned with education and training within the State in the development of the vocational education plans. (P.L. 94-482 Sec. 101) (p.25).

The mandate for cooperative planning to achieve improved equal access to employment opportunities requires greater shared understanding of local labor market conditions. States are required to provide assurances that a coordinated approach will be used (a) to meet area and community vocational education and training needs (Sec. 106(a) (4) (c)); (b) to establish criteria for coordinating vocational education and manpower training programs conducted by CETA prime sponsors in the five year plan (Sec. 107(b) (5)); and (c) to document the results of coordinated programs in the annual program plan and accountability report (Sec. 108(b) (c) (i)). As further evidence of the need to develop more adequate labor market information, one need only note the Congressional requirement in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 is that each state seeking assistance must establish an occupational information system to meet information needs both for the planning and operation of programs assisted by this Act and by CETA prime sponsors (P.L. 94-482 Sec. 161(b) (2)).

NOICC and North Carolina SOICC

Congress created an agency to assist each state in producing labor market information in section 202(a) of the Vocational Education Amendments Act of 1976 by establishing the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) and a network of State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICCs). They have specific responsibilities to develop and implement occupational information systems at the state and national levels. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act as amended by the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (P.L. 95-93) also directs the Department of Labor to join in supporting the work of the NOICC. Further, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-524 Sec. 315) directs the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee to "give special attention to the labor market information needs of youth."

Among other things, the NOICC is given responsibility for

> "(2)providing technical assistance for programs of computer on-line terminals and other facilities to utilize and implement occupational and career information and projections supplied by State employment service agencies and to improve the match of youth career desires with available and anticipated labor demand;
>
> "(3)assisting and encouraging the development of State occupational information systems, accessible to local schools, including pilot programs in the use of computers to facilitate such access; and
>
> "(5)in cooperation with State and local educational agencies, and other appropriate persons and organizations, encouraging programs to make available employment and career counseling to postsecondary youths;"

On February 7, 1978, an Interagency Agreement (signed by the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, the Commissioner of the Office of Education, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Administrator of the National Center for Education Statistics) emphasized that NOICC has been established

> with the general purpose of improving coordination, communication, and cooperation in the development of an occupational information system designed to meet the common occupational information and data needs of the vocational education programs and employment and training programs at national, state, and local levels.

In summary then, NOICC's important purpose is to assist states in the development of reliable occupational supply and demand data, so that education and manpower programs can be based upon reasonable expectations of available career opportunities. Further, there needs to be progress toward including data on occupational demand and occupational supply based on uniform definitions, standardized estimating procedures, and standardized occupational classification systems. NOICC has been directed to achieve what many observers of labor market information problems have long recommended as needing to be done. The lack of integration and cooperation between agencies in the compilation of occupational information means that youth and adults are unable to have and use occupational information effectively. The occupational information that is available tends not to be assembled for ready use. This information frequently has no relevance to the particular local situation and is often out-ot-date and incomplete.

The foregoing is the situation despite the fact that considerable sums are budgeted each year for the production of labor market information qua occupational information. A very critical view of the piece-meal methods that are at the base of the consequent confusion is set forth by Levitan, Mangum, and Marshall who state that:

> Ten years of labor in the 'vineyard' of manpower policy convinced us that the integration of human resource development, labor market economics, and economic theory had been too long neglected. (18, p. xvii).

If this intellectual and organizational weakness could be corrected, perhaps the recommendation set forth by Yavitz, et.al. could be achieved. It is: "Labor market policy should rank equally with monetary, fiscal, and trade policy."[3]

* * * * *

Rationale for Congressional Mandate

The fact that the Federal government has been giving ever greater importance to labor market information raises the following question: "Why do Congress and manpower planning experts agree that an organized national occupational information system is necessary?"

First, traditionally, a very important part of labor market information has been transmitted to those at the point of career decision-making by means of a network of family relationships. With the disruption and dispersion of families, this kind of information diminishes and falters. It becomes necessary to develop channels of labor market information to substitute for what was once efficiently transmitted between family members.

Second, the overwhelming complexity of our society has created a new job-decision situation. A society changeless in techniques and tastes would not need a highly developed information system. Indeed, one of the prime functions of an occupational information system is to inform people that things tomorrow will differ from what they are today. Every year new occupations are developing that did not previously exist.

Third, unemployment and underemployment rates are too high in part because barriers to the flow of information about job vacancies prevent job seekers from finding out about them.

---

[3] Boris Yavitz, Dean W. Morse, with Anna B. Dutka. The Labor Market: An Information System. New York: Praefer, 1973, p.8.

Fourth, if young people flounder in the labor market when they first enter it, we must provide a way to assist them by giving them up-to-date relevant information about occupations. In earlier times most of the existing occupations could be encountered and observed by young people as they grew up. Now, many occupations are invisible.

Fifth, some observers point out that in inflationary situations resulting largely from rising labor costs, the provision of more job market information would not only hold down such costs and increase worker productivity, but also increase the level of employment as well.

Sixth, a satisfactory occupational information system has a built in economic pay-off that gives dividends to present and future generations. It is not a panacea for all the unemployment, but it is an essential step in diminishing to some extent the threat that enforced idleness brings to spiritual and moral stability.

Seventh, studies by Herbert S. Parnes and others have shown that, other things being equal, individuals with access to occupational information and career information receive more remuneration and suffer less unemployment during their working lives.

These are basic considerations that have lead Congress to enact the legislation that has been described. Finally, it goes without saying, the more people there are with jobs - the more tax income there is available.

* * * * *

Defining Labor Market Information

Planners of vaocational education programs, CETA manpower training programs, and Employment Security Agency administrators must become increasingly cognizant of the incidence and severity of local labor market problems. These problems inhibit employment access for various groups in the population. Also, planners need to be knowledgeable about the characteristics and needs of individuals in these various groups that are targeted to receive education and training. The existence of an occupational information system is to be justified by its capacity and ability to properly serve its main clientele: job seekers, employers, educational institutions, Vocational Education planners, and CETA planners.

The literature is rife with reference to labor markets (see Bibliographical items 2-6, 10, 11, 14, 18-21, 27, 29) and to educational manpower planning (12, 13, 26) and manpower program planning (1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 22, 25, 30). It is remarkably silent, however, with respect to methods by which labor markets can be conceptualized so as to provide a rationale for the design and development of an occupational information system that will benefit planners and clients. One notable exception is the work by Yavitz and Morse (31). They regard a labor market as flows of prospective employees (supply) and job vacancies (demand) together with the inter-related institutions, processes, and functions that moderate these flows on short and long-term bases. These flows are seen to converge in the job market - an arena where transactions occur between the buyers and sellers of skills.

The flows of prospective employees and job vacancies are influenced by intermediaries which are external to the job market. Certain intermediaries such as public and private employment agencies, publications, job banks, counseling services, and friends and relatives directly influence the job market match between prospective employees and job vacancies.

Other intermediaries exert an indirect influence on the job market. On the supply side, guidance, education, and manpower planning operate to moderate the flow of potential applicants; thus indirectly influencing the job market. On the demand side, employer personnel planning moderates the flow of job vacancies. Unions are seen to have an effect both on job vacancies and on the supply of potential applicants. Finally, government influences the demand side through economic development and influences the supply side through educational and manpower policies.

In 1970, Joseph Epstein of the Manpower Administration's Office of Research defined labor market information as follows:

> The body of labor market information refers to detailed and comprehensive information on the magnitude of dynamics of employment and the factors that influence them, the characteristics of the labor force and the processes that bring workers and jobs together. It refers to the economic intelligence used by manpower and other agencies in assuring the efficient functioning of the labor market at all levels. It is a body of knowledge needed for the elimination of frictions in the labor market arising from a lack of knowledge of job opportunities and of labor supply. It also refers to the body of knowledge on overall trends in the labor market force -- employment, unemployment, underemployment, geographic mobility, wages, turnover -- and other information needed for a comprehensive analysis of manpower for program development, for policy guidance, and for legislative enactment.[4]

---

[4] Proceedings of a Conference on Labor Market Information Systems: Information Needs, Sources and Methods of Delivery. (Berkley, California: University of California, Department of Industrial Engineering, November, 1970). Page 6.

Labor market information, according to Yavtiz and Morse (op. cit.) can be general or specific. General labor market information is a synthesis of the operation of many often heterogeneous and spatially separated job markets. Because it is an amalgam of the operations of specific markets, general labor market information is more representative of large labor markets. In contrast, specific labor market information tends to be more descriptive of the operation of local job markets. This information is particularly useful to individuals searching for jobs because it is "firm-specific" information such as the location of job opportunities by company name, firms that customarily hire workers with certain experience and training, company hiring requirements and restrictions, and ports of entry for hiring.

Potential Needs

Needs for labor market information differ according to the user's role in the labor market. Employers' and potential applicants' informational needs are seen to differ from those of the intermediaries. Employers' needs for information stem primarily from their desire to fill job vacancies. In order to attract a queue of qualified candidates, the employer requires information on prevailing wage rates, sources of supply of qualified candidates, and information with which to screen out individuals with low probabilities of success. Individual applicants may need general and/or specific labor market information depending upon whether they are exploring general employment prospects and career options or seeking employment in specific occupations in local labor markets.

Vocational Education and manpower planners require a variety of labor market information to support decisions to allocate resources according to a specific program mix. It can be argued in a normative sense that planners need information on:

- the number of those estimated to be in need of vocational and manpower programs and services
- the personal and labor force characteristics of those in need of services
- the nature and structure of unemployment in the local area
- the incidence of unemployment in specific target populations
- the factors influencing high unemployment rates experienced by certain target groups
- current employment levels and projected employment requirements by industry and occupation

- current anticipated job openings
- turnover rates by occupation
- employer skill requirements
- entry level jobs by occupational areas

Among the major institutional intermediaries in the labor market are career guidance and placement services as provided by schools, Employment Security and private employment agencies, and state and local organizations such as vocational rehabilitation, social services and community action programs. Ideally, both general and specific labor market information is required to provide individuals with sufficient information about the world of work to support informed career decision-making and to support education and training program placement. General information for these purposes ideally should be inclusive of:

- short and long-term occupational employment requirements
- descriptions of typical job duties by occupations
- anticipated changes in descriptions of typical job duties
- anticipated short and long-term supply for the occupation - also demand
- wage and salary information by occupation
- hiring requirements by occupation
- characteristics of workers customarily hired by occupation

Specific labor market information should include:

- locational information on area employers
- occupational distributions by area employers
- area employment potential for special worker groups
- job vacancies by establishment
- anticipated short-term and long-term area demand for occupations - also supply
- local area economic outlook

57

- listing of local sub-state and state educational and training opportunities by occupation
- apprenticeship opportunities by establishment and by occupation
- licensing and/or credentialing requirements by occupation

State economic development efforts represent another intermediary whose needs could be satisfied by a multi-purpose occupational information system. North Carolina has recently established a thirteen member Labor Force Development Council. This Council is charged with advising and assisting the Secretary of Commerce in developing and carrying out policies and programs related to the development and utilization of the labor force to support industrial and economic expansion in North Carolina. In order to discharge its responsibilities the Council can make use of selected labor market information which could be available through an occupational information system.

Occupational Information System Flows

In spite of cooperative Federal-State efforts to provide labor market data, there remain continuing deficiencies that inhibit usefulness for human resource development. These deficiencies center around problems of specificity, access, and format.

Because Vocational Education and CETA service delivery systems are decentralized, information on the local service area is required to support service delivery decisions. When there is an absence of systematic information on local client need for services and locally specific employment opportunities, Vocational Education and CETA administrators have often been forced to develop their own data estimates. These estimates are generally based on informal subjective assessment. The definitions, procedures, and methodologies are generally not documented or standardized across localities. As a result, local estimates are frequently not capable of being replicated and when aggregated to the State level often cannot be reconciled with other State-wide estimates.

Use of existing labor market information is often inhibited by insufficient publicity and/or the inability to retrieve the information. As Cohen noted: "Analysts, planners, and managers in the manpower field are frustrated by the inability to access information already collected." (5,p.6) He further elaborated the access problem by stating that "There is a great need for computer programs which can aid in the summarization, tabulation, and analysis of labor market information." (p.4)

Utility of data is frequently hampered by a fixed report publication format which is dictated by Federal reporting requirements. Levine after a review of labor market systems concluded that:

> Regretfully, neither the LMI (labor market information) nor the LMI needs of local office staff, acting as intermediaries and serving clients...has resulted in the development and systematization of the collection and use of local LMI for delivery of manpower services. (18,p.10).

We attributed these shortcomings to the fact that labor market information has been shaped by Federal Statistical reporting requirements.

Yavitz and Morse attribute these existing shortcomings in local labor market information to four factors.

> 1. There is no formal mechanism by which data sources can be located, inventoried, and categorized. No systematic effort has been made, to our knowledge, to search out, develop, or build up an inventory of the major information resources in any local market.
>
> 2. Even for known data sources, there are no formal exchange and distribution procedures between interested parties. The occasional makeshift arrangements put together by one or two data users are a far cry from the needed formalization of policies, procedures, and major distribution channels for effective interchange.
>
> 3. There has been no careful analysis of the cost and benefits of a cooperative data-sharing program to the participants. A quid pro quo voluntary system, moreover, requires the identification of the major information needs, availabilities, and gaps of participants as its exchange foundation.
>
> 4. Among the many agencies and firms that would participate in a data-sharing program, there is no single institution clearly identifiable as the coordinator or clearing house for the system. A variety of coordinative functions, coupled with some procedural authority, could almost certainly be required at the hub of a local information system. Ideally, again, such a coordinating agency would be accepted voluntarily by all participants on the basis of its contribution to their individual needs. (Op.Cit., pp111-12)

A search for the means of overcoming these four major difficulties has been going forward for a considerable period of time. At long last, with the creation of the North Carolina SOICC in June, 1977, there now exists a single Committee in North Carolina to serve as the coordinator for an occupational information system.

Within this system, data is to be identified by uniform definitions and collected by standardized collection and estimating procedures. The definitions and estimating procedures will be consistent with guidelines formulated by the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee which were published July 19, 1978. Insofar as possible, existing data sources are to used. Every effort will be made to improve comparability and compatibility of existing data through standardization of classifications and statistical estimating and analysis procedures.

Because of the recognized difficulty of having a universal all-purpose standard report serve the diverse needs of a variety of user groups, the emphasis will probably be on a generalized output format capable of providing a range of outputs upon request that are tailored to the unique needs of education and training planners, economic developers, job placement and career counselors, job seekers, and employers. Therefore, the North Carolina SOICC research project dealt with the following questions:

1. Who are the users of labor market data?

2. What are their information needs?

3. What labor market data are presently being collected?

4. How well do the existing data satisfy user needs?

5. What labor market data should be included in an occupational information system?

The evolving North Carolina SOICCC system is expected to produce the following benefits:

. Improved planning of Vocational Education programs

. Improved planning of Manpower Training programs

. Increased State and local agency coordination in the use of resources for Vocational Education and manpower training

. Improved client access to Vocational Education and manpower programs

- Reduction in search time for jobs
- Increased coordination of labor force development policies and economic development
- Improved placement of education and manpower training program completers
- Facilitation of career guidance and counseling
- Increased congruence of curriculum content with current job practices
- Strengthened communication linkages between labor force developers and employers

* * * * *

The general national policy that has been enacted by Congress in mandating and supporting the development of an occupational information system available to all is in accordance with one of the main animating principles of American life.

This is the belief that the average man can be trusted and encouraged by the freedom to make choices, if he has the requisite information.

With the help of informed guidance, such as will be available in the service provided by the North Carolina SOICC, there can be found adequate opportunity for exercising initiative and hidden talent and energies will be released for constructive purposes.

The world's work must be done. There is, indeed, no sounder or saner or more profound democratic challenge today than the imperative that every human being shall have the chance to work in a job that makes, at the same time, a living and a rewarding life.

Section II - METHODOLOGY

It is appropriate that a research project to investigate the data needs and data availability in five independent North Carolina state agencies should be directed and conducted by an interagency committee - the North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NCSOICC).

The NCSOICC is an interagency committee with members from the state level offices of the Employment Security Commission, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, CETA and the State Board of Education, with the Secretary of the North Carolina Department of Administration as non-voting chairman. This Statutory Committee, which has governing, policy-making, and voting authority is one in which each of the four Signatory Agencies has a veto over all NCSOICC policy decisions.

The Committee Members of the NCSOICC are Preston Johnson, (ESC); Bob Philbeck, (VRS); Alan Hill, (DPI); and Eva Clayton, (CETA); and Secretary Joe Grimsley (DOA) as chairman. The North Carolina SOICC plans to develop and implement (1) an occupational information system designed to meet the common occupational information and data needs of the vocational education programs and employment and training programs and (2) a career information system to assist and encourage the use of occupational information by people involved in the career decision-making process.

In addition, the NCSOICC was given the responsibility for executing this research study on assessing user need and data availability for establishing a multi-purpose occupational information structure to provide occupational information.

The NCSOICC contracted with CONSERVA, Inc. (401 Oberlin Road, Raleigh, North Carolina, 27605) to render certain technical and professional services in regard to this research project. CONSERVA is a private research organization specializing in research in vocational, manpower, technical, career, and continuing education fields, headed by Dr. Donald W. Drewes, President, who is the former Associate Director, Center for Occupational Education at North Carolina State University.

Under the direction of Joyce Kinnison, Executive Director of NCSOICC, CONSERVA undertook the development of the information needs assessment and data availability instrumentation. Potential labor market information needs were identified. Relevant literature and North Carolina State regulations, documents, policies, and plans were reviewed. A content analysis was performed by CONSERVA in conjunction with Dwight Meredith, Programs Coordinator for NCSOICC.

The resulting draft, "User Need Questionnaire", was submitted for review and criticism to the State and Local Technical Advisory Committee to NCSOICC. The members of the State Committee are:

Cliff Belcher (Department of Public Instruction), Ken Oleson (Community Colleges), William Fleming (CETA), Dave Garrison (ESC), Joseph Morrow (VRS), and Darrell Myrick and Allen Barwick of the Division of State Budget.

The members of the Local Committee are: John Worthington, Vocational Education, Kinston, NC; Edward Wilson, Jr., Wayne Community College, Goldsboro, NC; Doug Hearn, CETA, Winston-Salem, NC; Amos T. Cherry, Manager, ESC, Wilson, NC, and Ann Colenda, Labor Market Analyst, ESC, Durham, NC; Jay Collins, Counselor, and Landis Barnes, Evaluator, VRS, Durham, NC.

The draft questionnaire that they examined listed potential labor market information needs and an example of an information needs assessment instrument. This draft contained twenty-two generalized data categories which were defined by the specific exemplary data elements listed for each of them. The specific data elements included both quantative and qualitative information. It was assumed that the elements were needed in varying degrees across agencies, although a few of the elements might be needed to a high degree by each agency. The data categories included activities which mediate flows in the labor market. It was intended to provide agency representatives with a means of describing each of their specific data needs using descriptors presented in a check-off format to facilitate completion of a needs assessment instrument. The Technical Advisory Committee added a number of additional elements and two additional data categories to the questionnaire. The resulting questionnaire containing twenty-four broad data categories formed the basis for the final survey instrument. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix A of this report.

The recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee was to submit the revised draft of the "Occupational Information Needs Assessment Questionnaire" to the Statutory Committee of NCSOICC. This Committee then gave final approval with one modification concerning the Department of Public Instruction. In this instance, the questionnaire was to be sent first to the appropriate state officials for DPI. After the questionnaire had been answered and filled out by officials at the state level, copies of this completed questionnaire were then sent to appropriate local level education staff members to secure their responses and their judgment in regard to the elements in this user need survey instrument.

As a consequence of this process an intensive listing of potential labor market information needs was successfully prepared. This listing was reviewed by qualified experienced individuals for comprehensiveness, clarity of expressions and possible redundancy. The list of potential labor market information needs was approved for use in conjunction with a rating scale which asked agency representatives to rate each potential LMI need in terms of (1) importance, (2) frequency of use, (3) intended uses, (4) required currency of the information, and (5) adequacy of existing data. The questionnaire also asked the individuals answering the comment on problems of inadequacy of existing data that they consider to be important.

Finally, it should be emphasized that every effort was made by all those participating in this work by NCSOICC and CONSERVA to develop an information needs assessment instrumentation that would take account of and implement the suggestions about restructuring labor market information that have been set forth in Section I of this research report. The resulting questionnaire, with its division into twenty-four data categories with many subordinate elements, has been requested by and sent to SOICCs in more than twenty-five states for their use in under-taking similar studies and statewide investigations. It is the first data instrument of its type in this field.

The next step was the development of a sampling plan to survey North Carolina state and local level agencies to document labor market information needs. Guidelines were developed to define a recommended composition of the sample that would potentially provide the most useful, accurate, and advantageous information.

State agencies to be included in the survey and the sampling procedures were identified. The following agencies were included in the survey: Department of Public Instruction; Division of Community Colleges; Employment Security Commission; Office of Employment and Training; Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services; also CETA prime sponsors and local school systems, community colleges and technical institutes, employment security offices and vocational rehabilitation service units.

Local level agencies to be included in the survey of LMI needs were sampled in such a way that all seventeen multi-county economic planning regions were represented. (Region G has two SMSA's, so this was divided into two regions; one is Winston-Salem and Greensboro and the other is Burlington.) Each of the five state agencies participating in the study was asked to name one person as a contact in each of the eighteen areas of the state that were sampled. For the seven planning regions which contain a SMSA, the county with the largest population was selected; in the ten other planning regions, one county from each was selected at random. This structure was also used in such a way as to provide geographic balance for the survey.

In each county included in the sample, needs survey questionnaires were sent to (1) the largest local educational agency; (2) the community college or technical institute serving the county; (3) the employment security office serving the county; (4) the vocational rehabilitation unit serving the county; and (5) the CETA prime sponsor serving the county. The rationale for the selection of these local agencies is that representation of these agencies on the SOICC is mandated by P.L. 94-482, Sec. 161.

Letters were sent by Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. and Joyce Kinnison, Executive Director of NCSOICC, urging cooperation in responding to the survey. It was recommended that completion of the survey be accomplished through an ad hoc assessment committee. (See Appendix B for copies of the letters.)

The head of each State agency participating in the survey was requested to form an ad hoc assessment committee to be responsible for rating agency data needs using the survey instrumentation. Guidelines were provided for the suggested composition of the assessment committee. It was suggested that the ad hoc committee should be made up of people including administrators, program planners, counselors, and other direct service providers on the staff who have a feel for the agency information needs. Assessment ratings and other survey responses were determined by committee concensus.

Questionnaires to be completed by local level agencies were also completed, where possible, by ad hoc assessment committees. Committee representation did include planners, administrators, career counselors, placement personnel, teachers and occupational therapists. At this point in the discussion of the methodology it is appropriate to emphasize that NCSOICC was undertaking an exploratory investigation that had not been done before. This research had no hypotheses to affirm or dis-confirm. It is not assumed that the NCSOICC study in North Carolina would be expected to have the same outcome if it were conducted in another state. The NCSOICC exploratory investigation to identify what labor market information data is used and needed by the five state agencies at the State and local level is intended to find that information that will enable prudent decisions to construct an occupational information system.

One-hundred-ten questionnaires were sent out by NCSOICC. Seventy-nine completed questionnaires were returned. Detailed description of the breadth of this response appears in the introduction to Section III.

The procedure for editing and coding the questionnaire was carefully reviewed and followed. Each returned questionnaire was examined for answers that were inexplicable or contradictory. Where there arose a question about any response, a telephone call was made in order to get clarification and an intelligible response. A coding system was devised and the responses were hand coded onto IBM Fortran coding sheets. Each completed coding sheet was checked by a second person against the original questionnaire response in order to insure accuracy. The edited and coded questionnaires were then sent to the North Carolina Department of Administration Management Systems for key punching. The program for the analysis of the data was written in SAS by Sally Brower of CONSERVA.

CONSERVA was assigned the responsibility for documenting the availability of labor market data at the State and local level. This task began with a review of the most recent North Carolina Statistical Guide, which provides a topical listing of published data sources available from North Carolina State governmental agencies.

All five State agencies identified as a source of labor market

65

data for this study were contacted by telephone to set up interview appointments with the individuals most knowledgeable of the agency's data elements and collection procedures. Interviews with these agency representatives focused on current definitions of data elements and relating these to the elements specified in the questionnaire. Identification was also made of dates of data collection and frequency. Purposes of data collection and the year the data was first collected was also established. Information was secured on current restrictions (if any) on data usage, level of aggregation reported to the agency, source of data, extent of statewide coverage, recognized limitations, and copies of the 1,111 data source items that resulted were obtained.

All State agency offices were visited first, followed by on-site visits to various selected local officials to secure detailed information about data availability. The Raleigh-Durham area local offices were the local offices first visited. After documentation was completed at one agency at the State level attention was directed to the next. For convenience of travel, interviews at the local level with the five agencies were grouped geographically. With officials at the State level providing recommendations and clearances, NCSOICC arranged for CONSERVA staff to visit appropriate local level officials in each of three geographic regions of the State - Coastal Plains, Piedmont, and Mountains.

Interviews conducted with selected individuals representing the local level agencies that were surveyed focused on: (1) labor market data collected or held by the agency, but not sent to a State agency, (2) level of aggregation of data collected, (3) restrictions on data usage, (4) time of data collection, (5) extent of coverage, and (6) purposes for which data are collected.

The source documentation sheets for this data collection and the results of these interviews are presented in Sections III, IV, and V. This search revealed the available labor market data elements that are documented and matched with the needs. Each available data element that corresponded to an identified information need was described in terms of its frequency of collection, the collecting agency, and the smallest geographic area covered. A search was made to identify those information needs for which data are not currently available.

It should be particularly noted that the selection of sites for on-site interviews with local level individuals to secure information about data availability was made to achieve geographic balance, urban-rural balance, and ethnic balance. (An effort was especially made to include individuals who could report on the uses of the data being assessed as it impacted on American Indians because North Carolina has the largest number of this minority of any state.)

Further discussion of pertinent aspects of the methodology of this exploratory study will be found in the text of the introductions of the following Sections III, IV, and V.

It goes without saying that this study, in addressing the present lack of a coordinated system for identifying, collecting, and providing the localized data needed that are basic to the multitude of decisions that give shape, size and definition to local labor markets, can only provide a 1977-78 "snapshot" of the North Carolina labor market scene. Having secured a cross-sectional view and identified the data for labor market information, it is clear that it is practical to install a system for constantly updating and providing this information to institutional officials responsible for planning training and professional programs, employers, and individuals choosing careers.

This NCSOICC project has succeeded in developing the information needs assessment instrumentation and the source document survey forms to ascertain the availability of labor market data at the State and local levels. This can enable subsequent studies to be conducted in future years in North Carolina as needed and can provide the basis for similar studies to be conducted in other states interested in establishing an occupational information system.

Section III - ANALYSIS OF AGENCY NEEDS FOR LABOR MARKET INFORMATION

OVERVIEW

This section of the report is the result of a statewide assessment of the need for labor market information by various North Carolina state agencies. The study was conceived as an important step toward the development of a multi-purpose occupational information system. The project had four purposes: (1) to determine empirically, the data categories which represent the informational needs of users from the Department of Public Instruction, Division of Community Colleges, Division of Community Employment (CETA), the Employment Security Commission, and Vocational Rehabilitation Services; (2) to prioritize the data categories according to their relative importance to the above agencies; (3) to document information held, collected, and/or disseminated by the five agencies which may fill a data category need; (4) to determine which documented available information can meet surveyed agency information needs. The four purposes were predicated on the idea that once information needs were established and prioritized, a basic core of data categories and associated data elements could be derived from available information that would meet the shared information needs of the five agencies.

The objective of this section of the report is to document the results of analyses performed on needs assessment questionnaires. The needs assessment addressed the first two purposes of the study. To accomplish these purposes, the questionnaire was divided into twenty-four data categories covering various demand, supply, and related categories of labor market information. Each category has associated with it a set of data elements which are more specific than the category. The listing was reviewed and approved by the North Carolina SOICC Technical Advisory Committee comprised of State and local representatives of the five agencies. The list as it appears was used as the basis of the questionnaire. (See Appendix C)

The second purpose of the study as listed above was to prioritize the data categories according to their relative importance across agencies. To accomplish this purpose the questionnaire required that each responding agency rate the data categories for each of several uses. Ratings and other information on the questionnaire referred to the broad data category rather than specific data elements. A rating scale was provided which consisted of a five point scale. Values which could be assigned were as follows:

0 - No importance
1 - Below average importance
2 - Average importance
3 - Above average importance
4 - Critical importance

Ratings were assigned for each of seven uses that an agency might have for a particular category. These uses included job placement, program planning, program operations, vocational or career counseling, curriculum development, industrial recruitment, and reporting requirements. (If an agency had need of a category for a use not listed, it could list that use and assign a rating to it also.) Categories which received all zeroes from an agency would be of no use to that agency for any purpose. Categories which received a rating of critical importance, (4), for at least one use would be considered of critical importance to the agency making the rating. The rating scale was not applied to each of the data elements which made up the category. Data elements were simply checked to indicate that they were needed or left blank to indicate they were not needed. Of primary importance to the study were the agency ratings of the data categories. In addition to this information, however, the questionnaire solicited detailed information that would be essential in further information development efforts. This information is referred to in the analysis plan as a secondary set of seven analyses. These analyses are intended to ease the task of technical personnel involved in the construction of an information system data base. The seven analyses are repeated for each of the twenty-four data categories; they total one-hundred sixty-eight tables which are descriptive of the information needs of the responding agencies. The information contained in the tables, though intended to serve system development, functions as a sourcebook of agency needs While not providing direct answers to every question, there is a wealth of information to be gleaned, dependent on the incisiveness of the question. The tables are capable of much interpretation. It is not possible to show all of the conceivable analyses. To facilitate the task of readers in seeking answers to their own unique questions, some suggested uses are presented.

The results of the needs assessment are presented in tabular format. They parallel the organization of the questionnaire. Each question is analyzed separately for each of the twenty-four data categories. Overall analyses are made of agency ratings of data categories and these ratings are ranked to establish the relative importance of categories across agencies. The relationship of the questionnaire data to the analyses performed is explained in the analysis plan. For reference, the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Analysis Plan

Survey data consisted of one questionnaire each from each of the five agencies at the State level, fourteen questionnaires from local offices of Vocational Education, seventeen questionnaires from Community Colleges/Technical Institutes, twelve questionnaires from CETA offices, fourteen questionnaires from Employment Security offices, and seventeen questionnaires from local Vocational Rehabilitation offices.

The primary analysis of the data focused on the importance ratings of each of the twenty-four data categories[5] included in the questionnaire. For each local agency type, a mean was taken across respondents. It was not necessary to take a mean at the State level since each agency type was represented by only one questionnaire. The results are presented in the table titled, "Mean Importance Rating of Categories by Agency". (Page 30).

Information needs were then ranked by their importance ratings to achieve a measure of the overall need for each category. (Page 31) The highest rating assigned to the category by an agency, for any use, was the rating used in the rankings. Rankings were made across all agency types and levels to determine a single ranking of the categories and across agency types for both State and local levels.

The rankings were determined by using a similarity index. The similarity index varies between 0 and 1 according to the degree of correspondence of similarity between the ratings for each category need and the maximum possible ratings. A similarity index of 1 would indicate that all respondents assigned the highest possible importance rating to a given category. Conversely, a similarity index of 0 would indicate that all respondents assigned the lowest possible importance rating to that particular category. Thus, the similarity index functions to reflect both the absolute importance that agency respondents attach to a category need and the relative importance of categories. Put another way, if category 1 has a higher similarity index than category 2, then category 1 is assumed to be more important than category 2 for that group of respondents.[6] In this way, the similarity index can be used to rank the categories in terms of their importance to a specific group of respondents. The rankings of the twenty-four categories and their corresponding index are presented in the table titled, "Ranking of Category Need Across Agencies" (Page 31).

A secondary set of seven analyses was performed for each of the twenty-four categories. Analysis One identifies the intended use of the information for each State and local agency represented in the sample. The responses for local agencies are given in terms of the means of all respondents indicating a particular use. Other uses listed by agencies have been summarized in the table titled, "Other Category Uses Indicated by Agencies" (Page 176). Analysis Two shows which agencies felt that existing information is adequate to fill the category need. The responses for local agencies are given in terms of a frequency distribution of the responses for each agency type. The ratings were coded such that 1 signified that the agency felt the information was adequate and 2 that it was not adequate. Data on the adequacy of existing information for meeting agency labor market information needs was also analyzed across all agencies. The results are presented in the table titled, "State and Local Agencies Comments on Data Adequacy by Category." (Page 177) The interpretation is the same as Analysis Two above. Respondents' comments concerning the adequacy of the data are summarized in the table.

---

[5] A listing of the twenty-four data categories is presented in Appendix .

[6] For a more complete discussion of the use of the similarity index in the determination of the comparitive importance of a set of items, refer to D. W. Drewes, et.al., Data Needs in Vocational Education, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, 1976.

Analysis Three shows which agencies indicated a need for various levels of specificity for a particular category (e.g., total employment by industry). The results are reported by required levels for both State agencies and the percentages of local agencies of each type. Analysis Four reports the agencies need for various descriptors which may be associated with each category (e.g., total employment by sex). These two analyses recount the degree of detail needed for each of the information categories.

Analysis Five shows the required currency (e.g., daily, monthly, quarterly, etc.) of the data category for each agency level and type. The frequency distribution response at the local level for each of the five agencies is shown in Analysis Five for each of the twenty-four labor market information data categories. Analysis Five utilizes the code which specifies the alternative frequencies of updating which are preferred by the State and local agencies.

Analysis Six shows the frequency of information use for each category (e.g., daily, weekly, monthly, etc.) indicated by each responding agency type. The codes which signify the five frequency intervals are given with each table.

Analysis Seven performed for each of the twenty-four categories is a measure of the need for data elements which comprise each data category. Results are reported in terms of the percentage of State and local agencies requiring each element. Elements listed by the responding agencies under "Other" have been summarized in the table titled, "Other Elements Needed by Agencies" (Pages 178 - 180).

Suggested Uses

Undoubtedly, the agencies responding to the needs assessment questionnaire have in the past asked themselves a number of questions related to the substance of this study. For example, State level respondents may compare information needs with that of their local counterparts. They are well aware of their own problems and needs. The opportunity to compare their responses with other agencies opens up new vistas and provides a panoramic view of the needs that will ultimately shape a multi-purpose occupational information system.

The provision of guidelines for examining the tables is analogous to using a roadmap as a guide for a tour through previously unexplored territory. The format of the tables makes possible several comparative analyses of needs as follows: 1) for State level agencies across agency types; 2) for local level agencies across agency types; 3) for various agency types within a particular level; and 4) for the five agency types across State and local levels. Each type of analysis also provides a number of dimensions for which comparisons could be made within agencies or across agencies in one of the four ways suggested. Moreover, differences in needs may be assessed across the twenty-four data categories. The various analyses tables will be discussed in turn.

Overall analyses of the varying need for each of the data categories are contained in the first two tables on pages . By examining the table titled, "Mean Importance Ratings of Categories by Agency", the information needs of all five agency types may be compared. By making comparisons of the ratings assigned within each category, it is possible to determine the differences and similarities in the importance which different agencies assign to the same data category. By making comparisons within each separate column it can be determined which data categories are critical or of no importance to each agency level and type. One can also compare responses given at the State and local level for each of the five agency types for each data category.

The second table, "Ranking of Category Need Across Agencies", presents a priority ranking of the data categories by State and Local level (Page 31). The column titled, "rank" reflects the index rating which makes possible a direct comparison of the relative importance of the data categories. Thus, a category which received an index of .90 would be three times as important as a category whose index was .30. A comparison of the index column for State and local levels allows for the magnitude of State and local level need to be assessed in the same way. If the local need for a category was .40 and the State need was .20, the local level agencies could be said to have a need for the category twice as great as State agencies. The overall index is reflective of the combined or averaged needs of State and local agencies. The rank of a category serves as a simple indicator of the importance of a category relative to all other categories.

The seven analyses paralleling the questions on the needs assessment survey are repeated for each data category. Each type of analysis will be discussed in turn.

ANALYSIS ONE identifies the use made of each category for such "agency uses" as job placement, program planning, program operations, etc. by each agency at the State and local level. The most important uses can be determined for a particular agency by examining the columns. The "yeses" and "noes" at the State level indicate the simple presence or absence of use. At the local level the numbers represent the percentage of local agencies of a particular type which indicated use. A row analysis will reveal need profiles across agencies. There is also revealed the fact that some have the same uses for a data category.

ANALYSIS TWO indicates which agencies judge that existing information is adequate to fill the category need. The responses from the State level agencies show which State agencies appraise the existing information as adequate. The frequency distributions of the responses for each local agency can be compared to the matching State agency response to determine whether there is a disagreement on adequacy between levels of one agency as well as between different agencies.

ANALYSIS THREE provides a detailed listing of the occupational, geographical, and temporal descriptors desired for each category. By making column comparisons, the most frequently desired descriptors can be determined. Row comparisons make evident the level of specificity desired by individual agencies and across agencies. For example, it is possible to discern whether information broken out by county is more often desired than information broken out by Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA); whether categories are preferred by occupational cluster or by occupation; whether long-term projections are desired by a larger percentage of agencies than short-term projections. Looking across agencies, differences in specificity can be observed that will differ with the various categories. For example, turnover statistics are desired by a larger percent of State level agencies at the State degree rather than at the city degree of specificity. Economic indicators such as hours and earnings, wholesale sales, new business starts, etc. are desired by a larger percentage of agencies at the industry level rather than by employer level.

ANALYSIS FOUR provides a listing of the demographic descriptors needed for each category. Row and column comparisons can be made in the same way as described in Analysis Three. Cross-agency type comparisons can reveal other patterns of information need. For example, State and local level agency responses can be compared to determine whether general descriptors such as age, sex, and race are desired by a large percentage of agencies at one level, and target population descriptors such as female head of household, food stamp recipients, etc. are desired by a larger percentage of agencies.

ANALYSIS FIVE presents the frequency of update intervals such as weekly, quarterly, annually, etc. recommended by the agencies. By viewing the responses across categories, it is possible to determine whether one agency type consistently requires more frequent updates than another. For any given category, it is possible to determine the most frequent update interval necessary to satisfy agency needs. Column comparisons reveal differences in the currency of information required at the State and local level of the same agency and between different agencies.

ANALYSIS SIX reports how often agencies use information contained in the data category. Comparisons of the columns in Analysis Six tables with corresponding columns in Analysis Five tables reveal patterns in the relationship of agency update requirements to stated use. A comparison of columns within the Analysis Six table reveals the most frequent use by any agency and the frequency preferred by different agencies.

ANALYSIS SEVEN indicates a need for the specific data elements which comprise each of the data categories. Column comparisons reveal similarities or differences in the percentage of agencies at the State and local levels which need the element. The percentage in Analysis Seven can also be compared with the ranking of the categories (page 31) to see if patterns of high and low need are similar for both categories and elements.

Additional information was volunteered by respondents which is presented in two tables. The table titled, "Additional Information Related to Analysis One: Other Category Uses Indicated by Agencies" , lists the uses that agencies added to those included in Analysis One. Comparisons across categories reveal uses which are pertinent to more than one category. By looking back at the Analysis One tables to see which agencies indicated "Other", it is possible to relate to particular agencies additional cited uses that are in this table listed to particular agencies.

"Other Elements Needed by Agencies" (page 178), is a listing of data elements that respondents added to the list of specific data elements presented in each of the twenty-four data categories of the questionnaire. The frequency column measures the degree by which the different additional data elements were requested by the respondents. It might be useful to add that the specific data elements listed for each category are presented in Analysis Seven.

To further demonstrate how the tables might be used, an example is offered of how a question can be posed and answered. Suppose that an agency wishes to assess the extent to which it is important to that agency to know the veteran status of enrollees or completers of education and training programs. They would refer to the Analysis Four tables for categories sixteen and eighteen. At the State level, only CETA is interested in the descriptor for either category. Plans submitted by CETA Balance-of-State planners are required to show significant population segments being served; veterans would be one such significant segment. At the local level, some percentage of all agencies desire the descriptor for both categories with the exception of Public Instruction. Employment Security shows the greatest need for the information. A number of federal reports require information on veterans served by Employment Security. CETA lists veterans as one of the target groups they serve. Local Community Colleges and Technical Institutes must follow-up veterans to see that they have been placed in jobs related to their training. Vocational Rehabilitation, of course, serves disabled veterans. In many other cases, the reasons behind the agency expressions of need for the information must be discovered through interrogation. The tables thus serve as springboards for further discussion of agency needs. The tables presenting the responses reported in Analysis Four raise many questions about what are the considerations and reasons that cause the various agencies to need certain particular information. Discovering these reasons by means of developing an interagency dialogue will create the mutual understanding necessary for a sharing of information to develop a successful Occupational Information System.

Results

In the one-hundred and fifty pages of tables presenting the data reported on in this section of the study, there can be found a large amount of information that is important for the construction of a Multi-purpose Occupational Information System. Further, particular results of interest to the various agencies can be discovered.

An overall view of the tables shows the complexity of the differences of agency needs at the State and local levels. When the judgment of all agencies in appraising their data needs is examined, it becomes evident that with the exception of millage in category twenty-two, "Fiscal Information", all the data elements were needed by one or more agencies. Every category of data information was listed as rated at "Above average importance" by two or more State level agencies. This was somewhat surprising in a survey being conducted across numerous agencies with different mandates and functions. Looking at the table, "Mean Importance Rating of Categories by Agency", it becomes evident that while some categories clearly received lower ratings than other categories across the surveyed agencies, twenty-one categories received a rating of "Critical importance" from two or more State level agencies. Only thirteen of the one-hundred and twenty State level judgments rated any of the data categories as "Below average importance" or of "No importance." A careful examination of this table shows that a comparison of State and local needs for this information reveals that, in some instances, there is between "Critical importance" or "Above average importance" at the local level and no need at all for this information at the State level. The concept of a shared information system implies and empirical information supports the contention that a wide range of data is important in order to serve the needs of all agencies sharing in the system. It is also possible to determine from this table, by looking at the columns, those data categories which had a low priority for various agencies. It is evident that within a particular agency, many elements competed for top priority.

The ratings were also used as the basis for the table, "Ranking of Category Need Across Agencies" (Page 31). With only five agencies making ratings at the State level, there were numerous tied rankings.

It was anticipated that agencies having different mandates would have differing needs for the various data categories. However, an examination of Analysis One for the various categories reveals that each agency showed a multiplicity of uses for every category. Even the lowest ranked category is needed for several different uses by more than one State agency and every local agency.

75

Agency ratings of the adequacy of existing information for use show a disagreement between agency types. This may be indicative of the current state of affairs where data sources are fragmented and agencies differ in their ability to obtain needed data.

There was only one element which is not wanted by State agencies and even it was desired by twenty-one percent of local agencies. That element is millage assessment under the category, "Fiscal Information."

A content analysis of agency comments on the adequacy of data reveals that the primary problem with data is that it is available but incomplete (N=64) (page 177). Conversely, the second major problem cited is that information is not available (N=57). Responses differ for different categories. For example, the overwhelming problem with data on "Characteristics of the employed" is that data was available but incomplete. For data on "Characteristics of discouraged workers", agency responses show that the data is clearly not available.

An analysis of other elements requested by agencies (page 178) reveals only five elements requested with frequency by several agencies. All five of these elements come under category fourteen, "Identification of employers." They are:

	Frequency
(1) Standard industrial classification	21
(2) Number of workers by occupation	9
(3) Product of service	5
(4) Major skills required	5
(5) Person responsible for hiring	8

A practical use of the tabulated information on agency needs is to help develop decision criteria for system development. For example, the importance rating provides a measure of the relative importance of each category. This information can be used by agencies in establishing decision criteria for what to include in the information system. For example, agencies can establish a decision rule using the rating to establish cut-off points. The same decision criteria can be developed for elements as well as categories. The important point to make is that the needs assessment is only descriptive of what is desired. Criteria for system development for what should be are superimposed on the description of need by the agencies who will ultimately be the users and providers of labor market information.

TABLES:

ANALYSIS OF AGENCY NEEDS
FOR
LABOR MARKET INFORMATION

January, 1979

North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee

MEAN IMPORTANCE RATING OF CATEGORIES BY AGENCY

CATEGORY	PUBLIC INSTRUCTION		COMMUNITY COLLEGES		COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT		EMPLOYMENT SECURITY		VOCATIONAL REHABILITN.	
	State N=1	Local N=14	State N=1	Local N=17	State N=1	Local N=12	State N=1	Local N=14	State N=1	Local N=17
1	4	4	3	3.76	4	3.33	4	4	4	3.76
2	4	4	3	3.71	4	3.17	4	4	4	3.78
3	4	4	3	3.71	4	3.58	4	3.93	4	3.65
4	4	4	3	2.71	4	3.58	4	3.21	4	3.18
5	3	4	3	3.41	4	3.5	4	3.86	4	2.88
6	4	4	3	3.59	4	3.92	4	3.86	4	3.71
7	4	4	3	3.47	4	3.33	4	3.71	4	3.41
8	4	3.07	3	3.41	4	3.75	4	4	3	2.76
9	4	3.14	3	3.53	4	3.75	4	3.86	0	2
10	4	3	3	3.41	4	3.25	2	3.36	2	3.35
11	4	3.14	3	3.24	4	3.5	4	3.86	0	2.53
12	4	3.07	3	3.12	4	2.75	0	3.43	2	2.88
13	2	3	3	2.94	4	3.25	0	3.5	2	2.47
14	4	4	3	3.12	4	2.92	4	3.07	4	3.35
15	0	.29	3	2.71	0	2.58	3	3.43	0	2.29
16	4	4	3	3.47	4	3.08	4	3.36	0	3.18
17	4	4	3	3.29	4	2.67	4	3.5	0	3
18	4	4	3	3.47	4	2.58	4	2.64	3	2.76
19	4	4	3	2.82	4	2.92	4	2.71	2	2.35
20	4	3	3	3	4	3.42	3	2.64	4	2.06
21	3	4	3	3.18	4	3.33	4	3.71	4	2.75
22	3	3	3	1.88	1	2.25	0	1.6	0	.88
23	4	4	3	3.35	4	3.67	2	3.5	4	3.29
24	4	4	3	3.12	4	3.33	4	3.71	4	3.23

CODE
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

RANKING OF CATEGORY NEED ACROSS AGENCIES

CATEGORY	STATE (N=5)		LOCAL (N=74)	
	RANK	SIMILARITY INDEX[1]	RANK	SIMILARITY INDEX
1	1 *	.91	2	.893
2	1 *	.91	4	.875
3	1 *	.91	3	.891
4	1 *	.91	12	.707
5	8 **	.83	7	.788
6	1 *	.91	1	.910
7	15	.73	5	.807
8	8 **	.83	10	.734
9	16 ****	.71	13	.690
10	20	.61	17	.671
11	16 ****	.71	16	.673
12	21	.56	19	.584
13	22	.41	20	.582
14	1 *	.91	15	.686
15	24	.23	23	.388
16	16 ****	.71	9	.736
17	16 ****	.71	14	.690
18	8 **	.83	18	.616
19	13 ***	.76	21	.567
20	8 **	.83	22	.571
21	8 **	.83	11	.731
22	23	.24	24	.261
23	13 ***	.76	6	.797
24	1 *	.91	8	.763

[1] NOTE: See discussion of Similarity Index on pages 22 and 24.

* Indicates tied rankings for first place

** Indicates tied rankings for eighth place

*** Indicates tied rankings for thirteenth place

**** Indicates tied rankings for sixteenth place

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED (TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	3	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.29	1.67	3.93	3.65
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	3	4	3	3.07	3.18	3.25	3.07	2.65
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	3	3	4	4	3.00	2.59	1.92	3.36	2.24
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.00	1.17	3.14	3.65
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	2	3.07	3.29	0.92	0.64	1.88
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	2	3	0	4	0	2.00	1.94	1.42	2.93	1.76
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	3	3	0	4	0	3.00	1.88	1.17	3.21	1.88
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	13	6	1	11	8
C	1	11	10	3	9

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED
(TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	83%	79%	76%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	50%	79%	65%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	88%	83%	71%	94%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	53%	50%	43%	82%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	25%	71%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	18%	42%	36%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	76%	58%	57%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	67%	79%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	42%	50%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	25%	0%	24%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	75%	57%	47%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	71%	75%	50%	59%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	67%	64%	47%

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED (TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	75%	86%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	83%	79%	59%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	88%	67%	86%	35%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	100%	75%	100%	65%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	41%	67%	64%	47%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	8%	7%	24%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	18%	33%	79%	35%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	42%	21%	65%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	35%	25%	36%	82%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	53%	58%	86%	100%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	50%	50%	29%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED (TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	47%	75%	100%	35%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	12%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	67%	57%	18%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	7%	29%	33%	43%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	18%	17%	14%	88%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	41%	50%	71%	76%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	67%	43%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	71%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	42%	21%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	42%	71%	24%

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED (TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	0	0	0	3
D	0	3	4	7	2
E	14	7	4	3	7
F	0	2	0	0	1
G	0	5	2	2	4
H	0	0	1	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	B	F

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	0	3	1	8	3
C	0	1	0	1	6
D	0	3	4	3	3
E	14	7	3	2	4
F	0	3	3	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS CUSTOMARILY HIRED
(TRAITS AND QUALITIES GENERALLY ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYER ACCEPTANCE)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Educational attainment	100%	98%
2. Skill level	100%	89%
3. Interest patterns	60%	52%
4. Physical capabilities	100%	64%
5. Work experience	80%	92%
6. Age	80%	68%
7. Training background	80%	95%
8. Licenses, accreditations, certificates held	100%	76%
9. Other	20%	12%

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB
(USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.06	1.50	3.93	3.67
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	3	4	3	4.00	3.06	3.17	2.43	2.78
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	3	3	4	4	3.00	2.35	1.67	2.57	2.39
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.18	1.67	2.71	3.61
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	1	3	3	0	2	3.07	3.24	1.67	0.29	1.83
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	4	0	2.00	1.88	1.50	2.86	2.00
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	2	3	0	4	0	1.00	1.41	1.25	2.79	1.72
OTHER	4	0	0	0	0	.00	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance: 0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	14	5	2	9	5
C	0	12	9	5	12

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB (USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	92%	79%	76%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	67%	57%	65%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	88%	75%	86%	76%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	Yes	No	100%	59%	58%	57%	82%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	25%	43%	71%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	24%	33%	57%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	65%	58%	57%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	75%	79%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	33%	36%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	17%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	83%	64%	53%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	71%	67%	57%	53%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	58%	57%	53%

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB (USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	67%	50%	71%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	75%	50%	59%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	76%	67%	57%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	100%	67%	71%	65%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	14%	47%	58%	50%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	24%	8%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	33%	57%	24%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	42%	14%	53%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	35%	25%	29%	76%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	42%	64%	88%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	71%	50%	43%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB
(USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	58%	64%	29%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	0%	0%	12%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	67%	50%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	24%	25%	7%	71%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	42%	57%	53%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	58%	50%	18%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	25%	57%	12%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	42%	14%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	25%	57%	12%

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB
(USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	0	0	1	4	0
C	0	0	0	0	1
D	0	3	3	5	3
E	0	6	2	1	6
F	0	2	1	0	3
G	14	6	3	4	4
H	0	0	1	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	D	B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	0	0
B	0	4	1	10	3
C	0	1	0	2	5
D	0	3	3	1	5
E	0	7	4	1	1
F	14	2	3	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF 'TYPICAL' JOB
(USUAL WORK PERFORMED IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Entry wage rates	100%	90%
2. Average wage rates	80%	74%
3. Duties and responsibilities	100%	91%
4. Working conditions and hours	60%	63%
5. Linkage with other jobs	80%	74%
6. Hiring channels customairly used	80%	72%
7. Licenses, accreditations, certificates required	100%	76%
8. Length of tenure	60%	55%
9. Sources of labor supply customarily used	100%	75%
10. Apprenticeship opportunities	100%	80%
11. Training opportunities	100%	88%
12. Fringe benefits	60%	78%
13. Other	00%	3%

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.47	1.75	3.86	3.53
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	3	3.00	3.06	3.33	3.00	2.41
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	3	3	4	4	3.00	2.24	2.00	2.71	2.18
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.06	1.33	2.86	3.35
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	4	0	2	2.00	2.71	0.83	0.64	1.76
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	4	0	2.00	1.82	0.92	2.93	1.71
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	3	0	1	0	2.00	1.47	0.83	2.71	1.76
OTHER	2	0	0	0	0	.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	14	5	3	9	8
C	0	12	9	5	9

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	92%	71%	82%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	21%	100%	75%	57%	71%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	88%	83%	86%	82%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	Yes	No	100%	59%	75%	64%	82%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	25%	36%	53%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	24%	33%	43%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	67%	50%	47%
BY COUNTY	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	75%	71%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	24%	42%	36%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	25%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	71%	47%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	71%	83%	50%	47%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	88%	75%	57%	41%

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	71%	83%	64%	76%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	76%	83%	57%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	76%	75%	57%	29%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	100%	100%	75%	64%	65%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	7%	47%	75%	43%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	No	No	No	100%	18%	8%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	100%	12%	25%	50%	18%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	29%	42%	14%	59%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	29%	25%	21%	82%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	65%	42%	50%	94%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	65%	42%	36%	29%
Continued ...										

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	59%	67%	64%	29%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	41%	83%	43%	0%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	29%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	7%	24%	25%	7%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	58%	57%	41%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	53%	58%	43%	6%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	50%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	21%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	50%	12%

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	G

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	0	0	0	3	0
C	0	0	1	1	2
D	0	4	4	4	3
E	1	6	2	3	4
F	0	2	2	0	5
G	13	5	3	3	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	F	B

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	0	3	1	6	1
C	0	2	0	2	9
D	0	4	5	3	5
E	1	7	3	3	0
F	13	1	3	0	2

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 3. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Seasonal/stable	100%	84%
2. Vacancies generally filled by new hires/ promotions	100%	88%
3. Temporary/permanent	60%	90%
4. Full-time/part-time	100%	81%
5. Consideration of special applicants	100%	81%
6. Other	0%	7%

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	2	3	3	0	4	4.00	2.47	1.33	2.43	3.12
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	1	3.00	2.12	3.50	2.43	2.24
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	3	2	0	1	2.00	2.06	2.08	2.07	2.00
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	3	3	0	2	4.00	2.47	1.42	1.71	3.00
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	4	0	0	2.00	2.18	0.75	0.14	1.76
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	0	0	0.00	1.71	1.08	2.43	1.42
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	3	0	4	0	0.00	1.12	1.00	2.07	1.71
OTHER	0	0	0	3	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	0	2	2
B	14	2	3	7	7
C	0	11	9	5	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	83%	71%	59%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	14%	76%	75%	43%	53%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	67%	57%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	41%	50%	50%	65%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	53%	17%	29%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	29%	25%	36%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	No	No	21%	59%	67%	21%	24%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	59%	75%	64%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	33%	14%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	8%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	59%	75%	57%	35%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	65%	83%	21%	47%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	71%	75%	43%	47%

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	59%	67%	50%	71%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	67%	50%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	58%	36%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	58%	43%	59%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	7%	41%	50%	7%	24%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	18%	8%	0%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	29%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	33%	7%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	24%	8%	0%	65%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	59%	33%	29%	82%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	65%	25%	29%	18%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	50%	64%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	42%	43%	0%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	25%	7%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	24%	17%	0%	53%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	33%	43%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	33%	36%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	43%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	33%	7%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	50%	18%

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	0	2	2
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	0	0	0	2
D	0	2	3	8	3
E	0	8	7	2	5
F	0	3	1	0	2
G	14	0	1	1	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	D	B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	0	2	2
B	0	2	1	3	1
C	0	1	0	3	4
D	0	3	3	3	6
E	0	7	5	3	1
F	14	0	3	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 4. TURNOVER STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE N = 5	% OF LOCALS N = 74
1. Accession rates	80%	74%
2. Number of new hires	100%	87%
3. Number of recalls	80%	63%
4. Separation rates	80%	64%
5. Number of quits	60%	39%
6. Number of lay-offs	60%	50%
7. Number of discharges	60%	34%
8. Other	0%	4%

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	1	0	4	4.00	2.94	1.33	3.14	2.65
PROGRAM PLANNING	3	3	4	0	2	3.00	3.06	3.17	3.14	2.18
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	3	3	0	0	2.00	1.82	1.83	2.64	1.76
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	3	1	0	2	4.00	2.88	1.08	2.00	2.59
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	2.71	1.08	0.36	1.59
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	4	0	0.00	1.59	1.17	3.07	1.47
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	3	0	4	0	0.00	1.29	0.83	2.86	1.59
OTHER	0	0	0	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	3
B	13	5	5	11	6
C	1	11	7	3	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	93%	65%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	83%	83%	64%	65%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	83%	71%	71%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	47%	50%	50%	53%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	59%	17%	50%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	29%	33%	50%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	21%	65%	75%	36%	29%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	83%	93%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	41%	50%	57%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	25%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	83%	71%	47%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	76%	92%	57%	47%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	94%	92%	71%	41%

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	71%	76%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	86%	65%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	83%	79%	47%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	94%	75%	71%	59%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	47%	67%	36%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	24%	17%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	6%	33%	50%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	50%	14%	35%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	29%	25%	7%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	59%	50%	57%	71%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	47%	33%	14%	18%
Continued ...										

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	58%	86%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	58%	57%	0%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	24%	42%	21%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	7%	18%	25%	0%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	42%	57%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	50%	50%	6%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	25%	57%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	42%	7%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	50%	12%

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	D	D	G

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	3
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	0	0	1	1
D	0	3	5	9	3
E	0	8	4	2	2
F	0	3	2	0	4
G	14	2	1	1	4
H	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	C	D	C

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	3
B	0	3	1	6	0
C	0	2	0	2	3
D	0	2	7	4	6
E	0	7	3	2	0
F	14	2	1	0	5

CATEGORY 5. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Number employed	100%	94%
2. Employment rate	40%	85%
3. Other	0%	12%

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE										
USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	4	4	4	4.00	3.29	1.75	3.71	3.70
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	4	4.00	2.32	3.83	3.21	2.41
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	3	3	0	4	2.00	2.12	2.00	2.93	2.24
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	3	4	4	3	4.00	3.06	1.67	2.36	3.59
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	0	1.00	2.65	1.58	0.43	1.94
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	0	0	1.00	1.76	1.92	2.86	1.59
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	3	0	4	0	0.00	1.47	0.83	2.64	1.71
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance: 0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	0
B	14	2	3	11	6
C	0	14	9	3	11

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	75%	71%	65%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	75%	64%	65%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	83%	86%	82%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	50%	57%	88%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	59%	25%	36%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	24%	25%	50%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	75%	29%	41%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	75%	79%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	35%	42%	29%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	12%	17%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	71%	47%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	71%	75%	43%	53%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	75%	50%	47%

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7%	71%	42%	29%	76%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	0%	71%	33%	29%	41%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	0%	76%	42%	36%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	88%	42%	64%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	33%	14%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	No	No	No	100%	24%	8%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	29%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	35%	25%	0%	53%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	24%	8%	0%	71%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	59%	17%	36%	82%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	59%	25%	21%	18%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	33%	64%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	41%	33%	29%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	25%	7%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	7%	24%	8%	0%	65%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	25%	36%	41%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	100%	35%	33%	29%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	36%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	33%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	50%	18%

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	0
B	0	0	0	7	3
C	0	2	0	1	8
D	0	2	4	2	3
E	0	8	5	3	2
F	0	2	1	0	0
G	14	2	2	1	1
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	B	D	B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	0
B	0	3	1	9	5
C	0	1	1	2	9
D	0	3	4	1	2
E	0	9	3	2	0
F	14	0	3	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 6. JOB OPENINGS (VACANCIES)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. By wage level	80%	83%
2. Number	100%	98%
3. Rate	60%	75%
4. Average length of time open	60%	81%
5. Reason for opening	80%	76%
6. Other	20%	7%

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	3	0	0	4	4.00	3.41	2.00	3.64	3.24
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	0	3.07	2.82	3.25	2.86	2.29
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	3	0	0	2	2.00	2.35	1.67	2.71	2.00
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	3	0	3	2	4.00	3.18	1.17	2.43	3.18
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	4	0	0	2.14	2.94	1.17	0.43	1.59
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1.76	2.08	2.71	1.65
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	3	0	3	0	0.00	1.47	0.75	2.43	1.65
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	C

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	1	0	2
B	14	2	4	13	7
C	0	14	7	1	8

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	75%	79%	82%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	14%	94%	67%	50%	71%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	83%	79%	71%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	Yes	No	100%	59%	58%	71%	59%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	33%	36%	41%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	24%	25%	50%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	65%	67%	21%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	75%	64%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	42%	14%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	8%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	58%	43%	59%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	82%	83%	50%	59%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	94%	75%	57%	41%

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	100%	65%	42%	36%	82%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	100%	65%	50%	29%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	100%	76%	50%	29%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	82%	50%	57%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	41%	33%	14%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	14%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	93%	12%	25%	21%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	35%	17%	7%	53%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	100%	24%	8%	7%	65%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	100%	59%	17%	43%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	59%	25%	21%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	50%	64%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	35%	42%	29%	0%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	14%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	7%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	33%	36%	41%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	35%	33%	29%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	36%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	29%	12%

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	F

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	1	0	2
B	0	0	0	5	0
C	0	1	3	1	2
D	0	2	2	3	5
E	0	8	4	3	4
F	0	3	1	0	1
G	14	2	0	2	3
H	0	0	1	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	D	F	D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	1	0	2
B	0	2	1	7	3
C	0	2	2	2	4
D	0	3	3	3	4
E	0	8	3	2	1
F	14	1	2	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 7. EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Replacement needs	100%	93%
2. Expansion needs	100%	91%
3. Other	0%	5%

121

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	1	0	0	3	3.00	2.82	1.92	2.86	2.24
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	2	3.00	2.71	3.67	3.36	1.94
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	2	3	4	2	2.00	2.00	1.83	2.79	1.47
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	3	0	0	3	3.00	3.00	1.25	1.71	2.24
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	4	0	1	2.14	2.47	1.00	0.36	1.29
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	1	2.00	1.71	1.50	2.93	1.12
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	2	3	0	4	1	2.00	1.35	0.92	2.86	1.18
OTHER	4	0	0	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	B

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	4
B	14	3	5	13	5
C	0	13	7	1	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	92%	86%	65%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	75%	43%	53%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	92%	71%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	47%	50%	21%	59%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	33%	57%	53%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	29%	25%	43%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	71%	75%	50%	18%
BY COUNTY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	83%	100%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	41%	50%	36%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	17%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	83%	71%	35%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	82%	83%	36%	24%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	75%	36%	24%

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	100%	64%	65%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	79%	47%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	71%	24%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	92%	50%	41%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	50%	29%	24%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	18%	17%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	0%	25%	36%	18%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	50%	7%	41%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	25%	7%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	67%	43%	71%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	25%	29%	18%
Continued ...										

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	53%	83%	86%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	41%	75%	36%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	18%	42%	29%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	12%	25%	7%	53%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	29%	67%	36%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	41%	75%	36%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	36%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	33%	21%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	79%	18%

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
D	G	D	C	E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	4
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	0	1	3	2
D	0	5	10	6	4
E	0	6	0	2	5
F	0	3	0	0	2
G	14	2	1	1	0
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
D	E	B	B	D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	4
B	0	3	1	6	0
C	0	1	1	3	4
D	0	3	9	4	6
E	0	8	0	1	2
F	14	1	1	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 8. UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Number	100%	92%
2. Rate	80%	92%
3. Other	0%	9%

127

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	0	0	0	3.00	3.06	1.75	2.93	1.82
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	0	2.07	2.53	3.50	3.07	1.41
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3	2	0	4	0	3.07	2.35	1.58	2.86	1.24
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	1	0	0	0	3.00	2.94	1.17	2.14	1.34
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	0	2.14	2.53	1.00	0.29	0.94
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	2	0	0.00	2.00	1.50	3.14	0.59
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	3	2	0	4	0	0.00	1.88	0.92	2.71	0.82
OTHER	3	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
C	C	C	C	A

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	7
B	14	4	4	12	6
C	0	13	8	2	4

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	71%	75%	93%	41%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	100%	88%	67%	64%	41%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	88%	83%	79%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	53%	42%	36%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	25%	57%	47%
BY SMSA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	35%	25%	50%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	71%	67%	50%	6%
BY COUNTY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	83%	93%	47%
BY CITY	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	100%	47%	58%	36%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	12%	17%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	83%	79%	35%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	75%	50%	24%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	94%	75%	57%	18%

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	86%	53%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	94%	100%	93%	47%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	94%	92%	86%	29%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	100%	83%	79%	35%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	42%	57%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	17%	14%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	25%	50%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	33%	21%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	29%	25%	14%	53%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	42%	64%	59%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	71%	42%	43%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	67%	86%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	47%	58%	50%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	42%	36%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	24%	17%	14%	47%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	50%	57%	29%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	47%	50%	57%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	57%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	25%	29%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	57%	12%

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
E	G	E	D	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	0	1	0	1	0
C	0	0	1	1	2
D	0	3	6	9	2
E	0	7	2	2	5
F	0	2	1	0	1
G	14	4	2	1	0
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
D	E	C	D	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	7
B	0	2	1	5	0
C	0	2	0	5	4
D	0	3	7	3	3
E	0	10	2	1	2
F	14	0	2	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 9. LABOR FORCE STATISTICS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Number in labor force	80%	88%
2. Participation rate	60%	82%
3. Other	0%	5%

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	2	3	0	0	2.00	3.12	1.67	2.71	3.12
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	2	3.00	2.76	3.25	2.71	2.18
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	4	2	2	0	2	2.00	2.06	1.42	1.93	2.12
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	2	4	0	0	3.00	3.12	1.25	2.50	3.24
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	3	0	0	3.00	2.76	1.42	0.43	1.65
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	2	0	0.00	1.82	1.17	2.79	1.53
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1.47	1.08	2.29	1.71
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	1	2
B	0	3	3	10	5
C	14	13	9	3	10

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	100%	65%	75%	79%	65%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	100%	76%	67%	57%	59%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	100%	76%	75%	79%	82%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	59%	50%	50%	59%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	25%	29%	53%
BY SMSA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	24%	25%	43%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	59%	75%	43%	35%
BY COUNTY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	83%	86%	65%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	29%	50%	29%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	17%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	92%	64%	35%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	76%	83%	43%	47%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	7%	88%	75%	50%	47%

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	[illegible] N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	82%	92%	71%	76%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	88%	92%	71%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	92%	79%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	94%	75%	79%	65%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	67%	57%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	25%	36%	18%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	42%	14%	53%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	24%	25%	14%	76%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	59%	50%	71%	82%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	42%	36%	29%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	65%	58%	79%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	67%	64%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	50%	43%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	18%	17%	7%	71%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	50%	43%	47%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	47%	58%	43%	6%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	57%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	33%	14%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	36%	12%

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
E	G	E	C	G

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	1	2
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	0	1	1	1
D	0	3	6	5	4
E	0	4	2	4	3
F	0	3	1	1	4
G	14	6	2	1	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
E	E	C	D	F

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	1	2
B	0	2	1	4	0
C	0	2	0	2	5
D	0	2	6	4	5
E	0	8	3	3	2
F	14	2	2	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYED
(DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRESENT LABOR FORCE)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Employment status	80%	92%
2. Commuting patterns	100%	80%
3. Licensed, certificated, etc.	80%	66%
4. Skill level	100%	86%
5. Education and training	100%	92%
6. Income (sources)	80%	45%
7. Number of weeks worked in the last year	60%	27%
8. Work experience	80%	79%
9. Part-time/full-time	60%	52%
10. Other	0%	7%

139

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	3	2	2	3	0	2.07	2.24	1.92	3.71	2.41
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	0	2.07	2.71	3.50	3.07	1.94
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	2.12	1.75	2.93	1.47
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	2	2	0	0	3.07	2.71	1.58	2.43	2.35
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	3	0	0	1.21	2.41	1.42	0.29	1.41
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.71	1.50	3.29	1.47
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	1	2	0	4	0	2.00	1.76	0.92	3.07	1.12
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	A

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	0	0	5
B	14	2	4	12	4
C	0	13	8	2	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	67%	93%	53%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	71%	67%	50%	47%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	83%	86%	59%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	100%	53%	42%	29%	53%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	25%	50%	53%
BY SMSA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	35%	25%	50%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	65%	83%	36%	35%
BY COUNTY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	83%	86%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	41%	58%	36%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	8%	0%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	83%	79%	18%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	71%	83%	50%	24%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	76%	75%	43%	35%

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	93%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	93%	47%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	100%	93%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	88%	75%	86%	41%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	67%	36%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	17%	7%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	57%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	42%	21%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	29%	25%	14%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	50%	86%	71%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	33%	43%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	65%	75%	93%	29%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	59%	67%	71%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	42%	43%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	24%	25%	7%	53%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	67%	79%	41%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	59%	75%	57%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	35%	17%	71%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	42%	21%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	29%	33%	79%	12%

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR. N=1
G	G	E	D	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	0	0	5
B	0	0	0	3	0
C	0	1	0	2	1
D	0	4	7	5	6
E	0	3	3	3	2
F	0	3	1	0	3
G	14	4	1	1	0
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	D	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	0	0	4
B	0	1	1	6	0
C	0	2	0	5	3
D	0	3	7	2	6
E	0	8	3	1	1
F	14	1	1	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 11. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE N = 5	% OF LOCALS N = 74
1. Occupation (last job)	80%	87%
2. Earnings (last job)	40%	50%
3. Length of unemployment	40%	78%
4. Reason for separation	40%	72%
5. Recall status	20%	34%
6. U. I. claimants	40%	37%
7. Skill level	60%	86%
8. Education and training	60%	87%
9. Number of periods of unemployment	20%	43%
10. Income (sources)	40%	37%
11. Other	0%	03%

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS (THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	2	2	0	0	0.14	2.06	1.58	2.79	2.88
PROGRAM PLANNING	3	3	4	0	2	2.07	2.65	2.75	2.57	1.71
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	2	2	0	2	0.00	2.00	1.42	1.93	1.41
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	2	2	0	0	3.07	2.71	1.67	2.43	2.76
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	3	0	2	0.00	2.59	1.42	0.36	1.33
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.21	1.65	1.58	2.14	1.47
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.41	0.83	2.07	1.12
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	A	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	2	1	4
B	14	2	1	6	3
C	0	13	9	7	10

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS (THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	14%	59%	42%	64%	59%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	14%	71%	50%	57%	47%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	58%	64%	65%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	7%	47%	17%	14%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	17%	36%	59%
BY SMSA	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	33%	50%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	59%	58%	29%	29%
BY COUNTY	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	21%	76%	67%	71%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	29%	25%	29%	53%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	7%	6%	0%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	67%	50%	18%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	65%	58%	29%	29%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	7%	76%	50%	29%	29%

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS (THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	29%	76%	67%	79%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	21%	82%	75%	79%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	21%	82%	75%	79%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	82%	67%	79%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	41%	58%	50%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	7%	24%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	6%	42%	57%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	42%	21%	59%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	18%	17%	29%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	59%	42%	64%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	25%	21%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS
(THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	58%	79%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	8%	7%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	67%	71%	18%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	33%	36%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	0%	18%	25%	29%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	75%	64%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	58%	64%	24%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	25%	71%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	29%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	57%	24%

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS (THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	A	G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	2	1	4
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	1	0	1	1
D	0	3	5	5	4
E	0	5	2	5	2
F	0	3	1	0	3
G	14	3	2	1	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	C	A	E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	2	1	4
B	0	1	1	5	0
C	0	1	0	2	3
D	0	4	4	4	6
E	0	8	3	1	1
F	14	1	2	1	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF DISCOURAGED WORKERS
(THOSE WHO ARE NOT ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK BECAUSE
THEY BELIEVE THEY WOULD NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Occupation (last job)	60%	81%
2. Earnings (last job)	20%	39%
3. Length of unemployment	40%	62%
4. Reason for separation	20%	66%
5. Skill level	60%	78%
6. Education and training	60%	83%
7. Number of periods of unemployment	20%	39%
8. Income (sources)	20%	37%
9. Other	20%	08%

CATEGORY 13. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED (STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	2	0	0	0	3.00	1.76	1.67	3.00	2.41
PROGRAM PLANNING	2	3	4	0	2	3.00	2.53	3.25	2.93	1.65
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	2	2	0	2	1.00	2.06	1.42	2.43	1.53
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	2	2	0	0	3.00	2.41	1.58	2.29	2.41
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	0	3	4	0	2	3.00	2.18	1.17	0.29	1.12
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	1.00	1.53	1.67	2.50	1.35
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.41	1.08	2.50	1.24
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	A	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	1	6
B	14	2	2	7	3
C	0	12	10	6	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 13. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED
(STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	59%	67%	57%	53%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	67%	36%	53%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	83%	71%	41%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	50%	36%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	47%	25%	43%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	25%	36%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	No	No	14%	53%	67%	36%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	No	No	14%	65%	75%	71%	53%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	29%	42%	36%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	75%	64%	18%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	65%	83%	36%	35%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	65%	75%	29%	41%

CATEGORY 13. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED
(STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14%	76%	92%	79%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14%	76%	92%	79%	53%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14%	76%	92%	79%	47%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	76%	92%	71%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	41%	83%	79%	47%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	7%	24%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	42%	50%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	42%	14%	41%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	0%	24%	17%	21%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	0%	41%	50%	57%	65%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	59%	42%	21%	24%
Continued ...										

CATEGORY 13. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED
(STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	75%	86%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	7%	12%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	75%	64%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	42%	29%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	0%	12%	25%	14%	53%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	83%	64%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	67%	50%	24%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	43%	18%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	33%	7%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	36%	24%

CATEGORY 13. CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED (STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	A	G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	1	6
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	1	1	1	2
D	0	3	5	5	4
E	0	4	3	4	2
F	0	3	1	0	2
G	14	3	2	1	1
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	A	E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	1	6
B	0	1	1	5	0
C	0	2	1	3	1
D	0	3	4	3	6
E	0	7	4	2	2
F	14	1	2	0	2

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 13 - CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDEREMPLOYED
(STANDARD CETA DEFINITION)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Number working only part-time, seeking full-time	80%	86%
2. Number working full-time at or below poverty level	80%	67%
3. Other	0%	3%

157

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS
(ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	2	3	4	0	4	4.00	2.88	1.42	2.93	3.12
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	2	4	2	4.00	2.12	2.42	2.29	2.12
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	2	3	0	2	2.00	1.59	1.75	2.57	1.76
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	3	2	0	3	4.00	2.41	1.08	1.79	2.94
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	2	0	0	3.00	1.88	1.00	0.14	1.59
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.71	1.67	2.29	1.53
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	4	0	3.00	1.41	1.17	2.00	1.35
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	B	B	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	2	2	1
B	14	2	5	10	4
C	0	12	5	2	12

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS
(ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	59%	67%	71%	71%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	No	No	No	14%	53%	42%	36%	47%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	100%	53%	67%	50%	65%
BY EMPLOYER	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	47%	75%	29%	59%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	29%	8%	21%	53%
BY SMSA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	100%	29%	25%	29%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	No	No	No	7%	65%	58%	14%	47%
BY COUNTY	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	67%	64%	76%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	Yes	100%	35%	33%	29%	59%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	0%	0%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	100%	47%	67%	57%	35%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	58%	21%	35%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0%	53%	50%	14%	47%

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS
(ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	7%	29%
BY SEX	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	14%	35%
BY RACE	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	7%	24%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	21%	24%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	7%	12%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	0%	6%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	0%	17%	7%	12%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	18%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	35%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	29%	53%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	7%	12%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS
(ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	25%	29%	12%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	0%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	14%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	7%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	0%	35%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	14%	24%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	7%	6%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	14%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	0%	8%	14%	0%

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS (ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	A	E	G

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	2	2	1
B	0	0	0	1	1
C	0	0	0	0	1
D	0	2	4	3	3
E	0	5	4	5	6
F	0	1	1	1	3
G	14	5	1	2	2
H	0	1	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	E	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	2	2	1
B	0	2	1	5	3
C	0	0	0	2	5
D	0	2	3	4	5
E	0	7	4	1	1
F	14	3	2	0	2

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 14. IDENTIFICATION OF EMPLOYERS
(ESTABLISHMENT NAME, ADDRESS)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE N = 5	% OF LOCALS N = 74
1. Other	60%	51%

NOTE: For detail on data elements desired, see list under Category 14 on p. 179.

168

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	2	-	3	0	0.29	1.47	1.75	3.43	2.29
PROGRAM PLANNING	0	3	-	3	0	0.21	2.24	2.50	2.71	1.65
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	2	-	3	0	0.21	2.00	1.50	2.57	1.41
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	2	-	0	0	0.29	2.71	1.75	2.29	2.24
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	0	3	-	0	0	0.21	2.06	1.25	0.50	0.76
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	-	0	0	0.21	1.00	1.42	1.36	1.41
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	-	0	0	0.21	1.33	1.00	2.21	1.06
OTHER	0	0	-	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance: 0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
A	C	A	C	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	13	4	2	1	7
B	0	2	1	12	2
C	1	11	9	1	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATF RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	-	No	No	7%	29%	33%	29%	35%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	-	No	No	7%	47%	42%	57%	35%
BY OCCUPATION	No	No	-	No	No	7%	35%	33%	64%	41%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	-	No	No	7%	29%	25%	29%	29%
BY STATE	No	Yes	-	Yes	No	7%	41%	17%	29%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	-	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	0%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	-	No	No	7%	59%	67%	29%	29%
BY COUNTY	No	No	-	Yes	No	7%	47%	67%	79%	41%
BY CITY	No	No	-	No	No	7%	24%	25%	14%	29%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	-	No	No	7%	6%	8%	0%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	No	Yes	-	Yes	No	7%	53%	58%	71%	29%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	59%	42%	36%	18%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	-	No	No	7%	59%	42%	29%	24%

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	No	Yes	-	No	No	71%	59%	58%	43%	24%
BY SEX	No	Yes	-	No	No	71%	65%	50%	50%	29%
BY RACE	No	Yes	-	No	No	71%	59%	58%	50%	24%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	No	No	-	No	No	71%	71%	58%	71%	29%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	-	No	No	0%	24%	50%	21%	18%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	6%	25%	14%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	18%	33%	7%	18%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	24%	25%	14%	35%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	29%	33%	57%	53%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	No	No	-	No	No	71%	47%	33%	21%	12%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	-	No	No	71%	41%	42%	71%	35%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	-	No	No	71%	18%	25%	14%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	35%	42%	36%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	18%	17%	7%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	12%	25%	7%	35%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	29%	42%	29%	24%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	-	No	No	0%	35%	33%	21%	6%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	12%	25%	29%	12%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	-	No	No	0%	6%	42%	43%	12%

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
A	G	A	E	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	13	4	2	1	7
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	1	0	0	0
D	0	2	4	7	3
E	0	4	3	4	4
F	0	3	1	0	3
G	1	3	2	0	0
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
A	E	A	F	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	13	4	2	1	7
B	0	1	1	5	0
C	0	0	0	3	2
D	0	4	3	3	2
E	0	8	4	2	3
F	1	0	2	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 15. CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY RETURNEES

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Skill level	20%	61%
2. Education and training	40%	63%
3. Other	0%	13%

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE										
USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	4	2	2	0	0	4.00	2.06	1.33	3.00	3.00
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	0	4.00	2.88	3.00	2.36	2.41
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3	2	4	0	0	2.00	2.06	1.83	1.93	2.24
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	3.18	1.33	2.29	2.76
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	4	0	0	3.00	2.76	1.67	0.64	1.59
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.47	1.67	2.00	1.47
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	4	2	4	0	0	0.00	1.59	1.17	1.64	1.35
OTHER	4	0	0	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	1	2
B	14	3	1	9	8
C	0	14	10	4	7

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATF RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	24%	33%	21%	47%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	No	No	No	7%	76%	33%	29%	41%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	100%	76%	33%	43%	47%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	33%	14%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	59%	42%	29%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	35%	17%	43%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	82%	67%	29%	41%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	75%	71%	47%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	24%	25%	21%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	12%	8%	0%	12%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	83%	71%	29%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	71%	58%	29%	29%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	50%	21%	35%

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	76%	83%	57%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	83%	57%	41%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	94%	92%	57%	35%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	94%	67%	64%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	29%	50%	29%	24%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	18%	17%	0%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	6%	17%	14%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	7%	41%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	25%	7%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	33%	43%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	25%	14%	18%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS
BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	50%	64%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	47%	50%	50%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	29%	25%	14%	24%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	18%	17%	7%	53%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	33%	43%	41%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	42%	43%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	36%	0%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	7%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	36%	18%

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	1	2
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	1	0	0	0
D	0	3	3	4	3
E	0	6	3	2	3
F	0	3	2	1	3
G	14	4	3	4	5
H	0	0	0	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	D	F	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	1	1	2
B	0	2	1	3	0
C	0	1	0	2	1
D	0	3	2	6	5
E	0	9	3	2	1
F	14	2	5	0	8

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 16. NUMBER OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS
BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Public certificate programs	80%	42%
2. Associate arts degree programs	60%	53%
3. Private certificate/associate degree programs	60%	40%
4. Public secondary general/academic programs	60%	68%
5. Public secondary vocational programs	80%	68%
6. Private secondary programs	60%	58%
7. Baccalaureate degree programs	40%	60%
8. Post-baccalaureate degree programs	40%	52%
9. Vocational rehabilitation programs	80%	69%
10. CETA programs	80%	83%
11. WIN programs	80%	69%
12. Community-based training programs	60%	44%
13. Apprenticeship programs	60%	76%
14. Private employer training programs	60%	59%
15. Union training programs	80%	48%
16. Other	0%	03%

175

CATEGORY 17. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	3	4	0	0	4.00	2.24	1.25	2.93	2.71
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	0	4.00	2.59	2.67	2.57	2.29
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	2	3	0	0	2.00	2.29	1.58	2.14	1.82
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	4	2	4	4	0	3.00	3.24	1.58	2.00	2.41
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	4	0	0	4.00	2.88	1.33	0.43	1.53
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.41	1.33	2.21	1.41
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	4	2	0	0	0	4.00	1.47	0.83	2.00	1.12
OTHER	4	0	0	4	0	0.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	A

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	3	1	3
B	14	2	1	8	5
C	0	13	8	5	9

CATEGORY 17. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	29%	33%	21%	41%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7%	71%	42%	21%	47%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	53%	33%	43%	47%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	21%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	59%	17%	29%	65%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	35%	17%	43%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	59%	58%	43%	29%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	71%	58%	64%	35%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	14%	41%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	7%	18%	8%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	58%	64%	18%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	59%	33%	43%	24%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	0%	59%	42%	36%	24%

CATEGORY 17. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	76%	67%	50%	59%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	67%	50%	41%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	82%	67%	50%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	58%	79%	59%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	41%	50%	29%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	8%	0%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	21%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	33%	0%	35%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	25%	7%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	42%	36%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	25%	21%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 17, CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4, STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	50%	79%	12%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	50%	57%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	25%	14%	24%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7%	24%	17%	7%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	33%	43%	29%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	33%	43%	18%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	29%	12%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	7%	12%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	43%	18%

179

CATEGORY 17. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	3	1	3
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	1	0	1	0
D	0	3	3	5	3
E	0	4	4	2	5
F	0	4	1	2	1
G	14	3	1	2	4
H	0	0	0	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	F	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	3	1	3
B	0	2	1	4	0
C	0	0	0	3	0
D	0	3	2	4	3
E	0	7	4	2	4
F	14	3	2	0	7

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 17. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLETERS/LEAVERS
BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Reasons for leaving program	60%	80%
2. Number employed/unemployed	80%	81%
3. Type of employment by type of training	80%	81%
4. Wage rate of employed	60%	65%
5. Reasons for unemployment	60%	80%
6. Other	20%	01%

181

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES
BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE .

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	3	2	0	0	4.00	2.12	1.33	2.57	2.53
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	2	4.00	3.12	2.33	2.07	2.12
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	0	2	2	0	2	2.00	2.12	1.50	1.50	1.71
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	2	3	4	3	2.00	3.12	1.00	1.86	2.35
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	4	0	3	2.00	3.00	1.08	0.43	1.53
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.18	1.25	2.00	1.35
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	4	2	0	0	0	4.00	1.47	0.83	1.50	0.88
OTHER	3	0	0	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	2	3	4
B	14	4	2	8	4
C	0	12	8	3	9

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	No	No	7%	29%	33%	21%	47%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	7%	53%	33%	29%	41%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	100%	53%	33%	57%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	14%	47%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	25%	21%	59%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	35%	17%	36%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	71%	67%	43%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	67%	71%	47%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	35%	8%	7%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	17%	0%	18%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	58%	43%	24%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	76%	50%	29%	24%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0%	76%	50%	29%	35%

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	88%	67%	36%	65%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	94%	67%	36%	41%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	94%	75%	36%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	88%	58%	43%	53%
BY INCOME LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	47%	58%	36%	24%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	29%	8%	7%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	17%	29%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	33%	0%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	29%	25%	7%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	42%	29%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	0%	53%	25%	21%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	50%	64%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	50%	50%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	24%	25%	14%	18%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	35%	8%	7%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	35%	42%	36%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	47%	42%	43%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	25%	36%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	33%	29%	12%

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLES BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	G

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	2	3	4
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	1	0	0	0
D	0	3	3	6	4
E	0	5	2	1	4
F	0	3	2	2	3
G	14	4	3	1	2
H	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
E	E	D	F	E

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	2	3	4
B	0	2	1	4	0
C	0	1	0	2	0
D	0	4	3	3	3
E	0	6	3	2	6
F	14	3	3	0	4

CATEGORY 18. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES BY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE N = 5	% OF LOCALS N = 74
1. Public certificate programs	60%	41%
2. Associate arts degree programs	80%	43%
3. Private certificate/associate degree programs	60%	36%
4. Public secondary general/academic programs	60%	61%
5. Public secondary vocational programs	100%	68%
6. Private secondary programs	60%	54%
7. Baccalaureate degree programs	40%	34%
8. Post-baccalaureate degree programs	40%	25%
9. Vocational rehabilitation programs	80%	66%
10. CETA programs	100%	81%
11. WIN programs	100%	68%
12. Community-based training programs	80%	73%
13. Apprenticeship programs	80%	76%
14. Private employer training programs	80%	67%
15. Union training programs	100%	49%
16. Other	20%	05%

187

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	1	3	4	0	0	4.00	2.35	1.50	2.36	2.12
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	0	0	3.00	2.35	2.58	2.07	1.71
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	2.00	1.50	1.86	1.47
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	2	4	0	0	4.00	2.59	1.25	1.71	2.35
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	4	3	3	0	0	3.00	2.35	1.00	0.29	1.18
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.59	1.17	1.50	1.41
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	4	0	0.00	1.35	0.92	1,64	1.79
OTHER	3	0	0	4	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	1	3	6
B	14	2	2	9	3
C	0	11	9	2	8

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATF RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	7%	59%	67%	50%	47%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	59%	75%	29%	35%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	67%	64%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	50%	14%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	47%	17%	21%	47%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	29%	25%	29%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7%	59%	67%	21%	35%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	59%	75%	57%	47%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	24%	25%	21%	29%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	17%	0%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	59%	75%	50%	24%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	65%	67%	43%	29%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	71%	58%	29%	35%

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	50%	36%	41%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	50%	43%	29%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	65%	58%	36%	24%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	58%	36%	41%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	41%	50%	21%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	12%	17%	21%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	25%	0%	29%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	18%	17%	0%	53%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	47%	25%	36%	65%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	53%	33%	14%	6%
Continued ...										

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	33%	57%	29%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	42%	36%	18%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	24%	25%	21%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	18%	17%	0%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	25%	29%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	25%	21%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	21%	12%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	21%	24%

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	G

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	1	3	6
B	0	0	0	[illegible]	0
C	0	1	0	0	0
D	0	3	4	4	3
E	0	5	4	2	4
F	0	1	1	1	4
G	14	3	2	2	0
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	C	D	F

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	4	1	3	6
B	0	1	1	4	0
C	0	1	0	4	0
D	0	4	4	1	2
E	0	6	3	1	6
F	14	1	3	1	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 19. OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(MOVEMENT WITHIN OCCUPATION NOT DUE TO GEOGRAPHIC MIGRATION)

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Occupational transfers	100%	74%
2. Re-entrants into labor force	100%	76%
3. Other	40%	01%

193

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	2	2	0	0	0	2.00	1.82	1.17	2.00	1.71
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	4	3	4	3.00	2.29	3.25	2.00	1.59
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	2	0	0	0	2.00	1.76	1.42	1.57	1.59
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	2	2	0	0	0	3.00	2.41	1.00	1.79	1.71
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	2.29	1.00	0.29	0.82
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.18	1.33	2.00	1.29
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	3	2	3.00	1.29	1.33	1.71	0.94
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.29	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	3	6
B	14	2	4	6	4
C	0	12	8	5	7

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

194

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	35%	42%	36%	29%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	53%	42%	29%	18%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	35%	42%	43%	47%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	33%	7%	24%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	59%	25%	36%	59%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	29%	25%	29%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	65%	83%	36%	29%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	71%	83%	64%	35%
BY CITY	No	No	No	Yes	No	100%	47%	50%	21%	35%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	8%	0%	0%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	65%	83%	57%	24%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	65%	83%	43%	12%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	65%	75%	36%	18%

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	92%	43%	47%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	92%	57%	41%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	92%	57%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	75%	43%	29%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	65%	50%	29%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	29%	8%	7%	24%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	100%	18%	33%	36%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	50%	7%	29%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	29%	33%	7%	53%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	100%	59%	50%	29%	59%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	59%	42%	36%	18%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	53%	42%	50%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	17%	7%	12%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	53%	58%	43%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	42%	29%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7%	29%	17%	7%	41%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	41%	50%	36%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	59%	50%	43%	18%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	24%	25%	7%	6%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	24%	25%	43%	18%

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	G	G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	3	6
B	0	0	1	2	0
C	0	1	0	0	0
D	0	1	4	1	2
E	0	3	3	1	1
F	0	3	0	1	3
G	14	5	4	6	4
H	0	1	0	0	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	E	E	D	F

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	3	0	3	6
B	0	1	2	4	0
C	0	1	0	2	1
D	0	3	2	2	3
E	0	5	4	1	3
F	14	4	4	2	4

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 20. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Family size	80%	76%
2. Income of families and unrelated individuals	60%	81%
3. Household living costs	40%	45%
4. Mobility patterns (geographic)	60%	66%
5. Birth rates	40%	49%
6. Death rates by underlying cause	20%	23%
7. Fetal, infant, and neonatal death rates	20%	16%
8. Cases of communicable disease	20%	12%
9. Fertility patterns	20%	14%
10. Arrest rates	20%	23%
11. Other	40%	05%

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	3	0	0	4	4.00	2.59	1.50	3.50	2.44
PROGRAM PLANNING	2	3	4	3	0	4.00	2.76	3.25	3.00	2.19
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	2	0	2	0	1.00	2.06	1.67	2.79	1.75
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	1	2	0	0	3	3.00	2.94	1.17	1.86	2.50
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	0	0	0	2.00	2.82	1.17	0.50	1.25
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	3	0	0.00	1.18	1.50	3.00	1.69
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	0	2	0	4	0	2.00	1.06	1.00	2.21	1.13
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	B	B	C

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	0
B	14	5	2	9	4
C	0	12	10	5	9

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	14%	65%	92%	86%	65%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	0%	65%	50%	29%	53%
BY OCCUPATION	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	100%	71%	58%	57%	59%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	50%	29%	41%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	76%	25%	43%	59%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	35%	17%	36%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	76%	75%	36%	47%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	100%	88%	83%	93%	53%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	Yes	100%	35%	42%	21%	53%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	12%	8%	7%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	100%	82%	83%	71%	24%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	88%	83%	50%	41%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	88%	75%	43%	41%

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	No	No	No	No	No	0%	41%	42%	21%	41%
BY SEX	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	41%	42%	21%	24%
BY RACE	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	42%	21%	24%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	41%	42%	29%	41%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	50%	14%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	No	No	No	No	7%	18%	8%	0%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	14%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	0%	41%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	0%	59%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	25%	21%	65%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	25%	21%	24%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	14%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	0%	47%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	21%	35%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	36%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	21%	12%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	29%	18%

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	3
B	0	0	0	2	0
C	0	1	1	0	1
D	0	2	3	5	5
E	0	8	4	4	5
F	0	2	1	2	2
G	14	4	3	1	1
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	E	D	D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	0	0	0	3
B	0	2	1	5	1
C	0	1	1	1	1
D	0	4	2	4	7
E	0	6	6	3	4
F	14	4	2	1	1

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 21. ECONOMIC INDICATORS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Hours and earnings	60%	91%
2. Wholesale sales	40%	52%
3. Retail sales	40%	56%
4. New business starts	80%	90%
5. Business expansions	100%	91%
6. Residential construction permits	60%	41%
7. Non-residential construction permits	20%	35%
8. Plant closings	80%	86%
9. Product out-put of manufacturers (durables)	20%	39%
10. Product out-put of manufacturers (non-durables)	20%	39%
11. Other	0%	03%

205

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	0.94	0.58	0.47	0.88
PROGRAM PLANNING	3	3	1	0	0	3.00	1.41	2.17	0.93	0.53
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	2	0	0	0	2.00	1.35	1.17	1.00	0.53
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	0.94	0.50	0.07	0.82
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	2	3	0	0	0	1.00	1.24	0.50	0.27	0.41
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	0.94	1.17	0.73	0.53
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	3	2	0	0	0	2.00	0.82	0.83	0.80	0.65
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	B	C	A	A

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	7	3	8	11
B	14	3	3	3	4
C	0	7	6	4	2

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	21%	18%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	21%	12%
BY OCCUPATION	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	21%	18%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	7%	12%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	35%	8%	29%	29%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	No	No	0%	6%	17%	14%	6%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	No	No	7%	41%	42%	14%	24%
BY COUNTY	No	Yes	No	No	No	21%	47%	50%	36%	18%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	8%	7%	18%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	100%	41%	58%	21%	6%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	58%	21%	12%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	53%	58%	14%	24%

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	0%	24%
BY SEX	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	7%	18%
BY RACE	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	7%	18%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	25%	0%	18%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	33%	0%	18%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	12%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	18%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	24%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	7%	29%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	6%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	18%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	7%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	6%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	24%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	0%	24%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	14%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	8%	0%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	7%	12%

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	F	A	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	7	3	8	11
B	0	0	0	0	0
C	0	1	1	0	0
D	0	1	2	1	2
E	0	2	1	1	0
F	0	2	0	2	1
G	14	4	5	2	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING

PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	E	A	A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES

	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	7	3	8	11
B	0	1	1	1	0
C	0	0	1	2	0
D	0	2	1	3	0
E	0	6	3	0	2
F	14	1	3	0	4

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 22. FISCAL INFORMATION

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Assessed property valuation	40%	48%
2. Property tax collected	20%	23%
3. Millage assessment	0%	21%
4. Income tax collected	20%	21%
5. Sales tax collected	20%	27%
6. Public program expenditures by program	40%	54%
7. Other	0%	03%

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	2	1	0	0	2	2.00	1.94	1.33	3.21	3.24
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	3	0	3	4.00	2.82	3.58	2.79	2.35
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	2	1	3	0	0	1.00	2.00	1.83	2.57	1.88
VOCATIONAL OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	2	4	2	4	3.07	2.82	1.58	2.57	3.24
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	3	0	2	3.07	2.88	1.42	0.79	1.65
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.59	1.33	2.21	1.41
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	4	2	0	0	0	3.00	0.94	1.75	2.14	1.29
OTHER	3	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	C	C

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	2	2
B	14	4	4	11	5
C	0	12	8	3	10

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	No	No	No	No	Yes	0%	41%	25%	36%	41%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	No	No	No	7%	53%	33%	21%	29%
BY OCCUPATION	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	0%	59%	25%	57%	53%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	Yes	No	0%	41%	25%	14%	35%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	82%	17%	36%	59%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	29%	17%	36%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	14%	65%	67%	43%	41%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	0%	76%	83%	86%	65%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	0%	41%	8%	21%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	7%	6%	0%	7%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	58%	79%	24%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	No	No	Yes	0%	76%	42%	43%	29%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	71%	42%	43%	35%

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	41%	17%	29%	47%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	47%	17%	36%	35%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	47%	17%	29%	35%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	47%	17%	36%	41%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	29%	29%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	8%	0%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	8%	21%	6%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	0%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	24%	8%	0%	65%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	35%	17%	29%	71%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	35%	17%	14%	12%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	57%	29%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	17%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	50%	12%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	21%	12%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	24%	8%	0%	59%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	21%	47%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	43%	18%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	17%	21%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	17%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	6%	17%	29%	12%

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	G

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	2
B	0	0	0	1	0
C	0	1	1	0	0
D	0	2	2	4	5
E	0	3	5	3	3
F	0	4	1	1	4
G	14	6	3	5	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	E	B	F

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	1	0	0	2
B	0	1	1	5	1
C	0	0	0	2	1
D	0	5	3	4	6
E	0	7	4	3	4
F	14	3	4	0	3

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 23. EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Program title	100%	92%
2. Program description	100%	95%
3. Eligibility requirements	80%	96%
4. Identification of program providers	100%	92%
5. Budget	80%	79%
6. Support services offered	100%	89%
7. Other	0%	09%

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 1. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF USE

USES	STATE RATING					MEAN OF LOCALS				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
JOB PLACEMENT	2	3	4	0	3	4.00	2.88	1.33	3.14	3.00
PROGRAM PLANNING	4	3	3	2	4	4.00	2.24	3.17	2.93	2.29
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	1	2	2	0	4	2.00	2.29	1.75	2.50	[illegible]
VOCATIONAL OR OR CAREER COUNSELING	0	3	4	4	3	4.00	2.94	1.25	3.21	3.00
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	3	3	0	0	2	2.00	2.24	1.00	0.86	1.29
INDUSTRIAL RECRUITMENT	0	2	0	0	0	0.00	1.59	1.33	2.07	1.24
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	4	2	0	4	0	2.00	1.06	0.92	2.21	1.24
OTHER	4	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Scale of Importance:
0 = No importance
1 = Below average importance
2 = Average importance
3 = Above average importance
4 = Critical importance

ANALYSIS 2. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE DATA

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
B	C	C	B	C

CODE

A = No Response
B = Adequate
C = Not Adequate

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES				
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	1	0	2
B	14	6	5	10	4
C	0	9	6	4	11

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 3. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF LEVELS OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED

LEVELS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY INDUSTRY	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	33%	57%	53%
BY OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER	No	Yes	No	No	No	7%	59%	25%	50%	47%
BY OCCUPATION	No	No	No	No	No	0%	53%	33%	57%	59%
BY EMPLOYER	No	No	No	No	No	0%	47%	33%	36%	53%
BY STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	25%	21%	65%
BY SMSA	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	0%	35%	25%	36%	12%
BY MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	7%	65%	50%	36%	47%
BY COUNTY	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	76%	58%	93%	59%
BY CITY	No	No	No	No	No	100%	35%	25%	21%	47%
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT	No	No	No	No	No	100%	6%	0%	0%	6%
BY CURRENT ESTIMATES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	100%	71%	67%	64%	29%
BY SHORT-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	No	No	No	Yes	0%	71%	58%	43%	29%
BY LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	0%	71%	50%	29%	35%

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY AGE	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	7%	41%	25%	29%	53%
BY SEX	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	7%	41%	33%	36%	47%
BY RACE	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	7%	35%	33%	29%	41%
BY EDUCATION LEVEL	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	41%	25%	36%	47%
BY INCOME LEVEL	No	No	No	No	No	7%	35%	25%	29%	35%
BY LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	18%
BY MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS	Yes	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	21%	18%
BY OFFENDER STATUS	No	Yes	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	47%
BY MENTALLY RETARDED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	24%	17%	0%	71%
BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	100%	29%	17%	29%	76%
BY LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS	Yes	No	No	No	No	100%	35%	17%	14%	12%

Continued ...

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 4. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS	STATE RATING					LOCAL RATING BY PERCENTAGE				
	PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
BY VETERAN STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	25%	57%	24%
BY ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	12%	8%	0%	6%
BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	100%	29%	25%	50%	6%
BY URBAN/RURAL STATUS	No	No	No	No	No	100%	18%	8%	21%	24%
BY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	14%	24%	17%	0%	71%
BY WELFARE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	29%	25%	21%	47%
BY FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	No	Yes	No	No	No	100%	29%	25%	43%	12%
BY FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	24%	17%	21%	6%
BY OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	0%	0%
BY UI CLAIMANTS	No	No	No	No	No	0%	18%	17%	29%	18%

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 5. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED CURRENCY OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
G	G	E	D	G

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	1	0	2
B	0	0	0	3	0
C	0	1	0	2	1
D	0	2	3	3	2
E	0	5	3	3	7
F	0	2	1	1	2
G	14	5	4	2	3
H	0	0	0	0	0

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily updates
C = Weekly updates
D = Monthly updates
E = Quarterly updates
F = Biannual updates
G = Annual updates
H = Biennial updates

ANALYSIS 6. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS OF REQUIRED FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORY

STATE RATING				
PI N=1	CC N=1	CE N=1	ES N=1	VR N=1
F	F	E	D	F

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSES					
	PI N=14	CC N=17	CE N=12	ES N=14	VR N=17
A	0	2	1	0	2
B	0	1	1	6	0
C	0	0	0	2	4
D	0	6	2	5	5
E	0	7	3	1	4
F	14	1	5	0	2

CODE

A = No response
B = Daily
C = Weekly
D = Monthly
E = Quarterly
F = Annually

CATEGORY 24. COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ANALYSIS 7. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY RATINGS INDICATING NEED FOR ELEMENT

ELEMENT	% OF STATE	% OF LOCALS
	N = 5	N = 74
1. Program title	80%	91%
2. Program description	80%	92%
3. Eligibility requirements	60%	92%
4. Identification of program providers	60%	90%
5. Volume of placements	100%	86%
6. Budget	40%	47%
7. Other	0%	03%

223

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO ANALYSIS ONE: OTHER CATEGORY USES INDICATED BY AGENCIES

CATEGORY	USE	FREQUENCY
1	Public relations	2
	Community liason	1
2	Incentive program	1
4	Economic analysis	1
5	Economic analysis	1
	Give to person requesting information	1
8	Federal government grant applications	2
	Give to person requesting information	1
11	Grant applications	1
13	Grant operations	1
	Give to person requesting information	1
16	To estimate total labor supply	1
17	Evaluation	1
	To estimate total labor supply	1
18	To estimate total labor supply	1
19	Component of employment estimate	1
	Program evaluation	1
20	Financial Aid	1
	Give to person requesting information	1
21	Give to person requesting information	1

STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES COMMENTS ON DATA ADEQUACY BY CATEGORY (N=79)

CATEGORY	NOT AVAILABLE	NOT AVAILABLE IN LOCALIZED FORM	AVAILABLE BUT INCOMPLETE	AVAILABLE BUT NOT CURRENT	AVAILABLE, NOT EASILY ACCESSIBLE
1	1	-	6	3	4
2	3	2	3	3	2
3	1	2	2	1	1
4	2	2	2	-	1
5	-	-	5	1	1
6	2	1	4	-	4
7	1	2	3	-	-
8	-	1	5	1	1
9	-	-	5	-	1
10	-	-	12	2	1
11	3	-	3	-	-
12	8	2	2	-	1
13	5	1	1	-	1
14	1	-	3	-	-
15	5	1	1	-	-
16	3	1	-	-	2
17	3	1	-	-	2
18	4	1	-	-	2
19	4	1	2	-	-
20	2	-	3	5	-
21	2	-	1	5	-
22	1	-	-	-	1
23	3	-	-	-	2
24	3	-	1	-	1

NOTE: Numbers indicate frequencies of agency responses.

STATE AND LOCAL:
OTHER ELEMENTS NEEDED BY AGENCIES (N=79)

CATEGORY	ELEMENT REQUESTED	FREQUENCY
1	Masters	1
	Unemployable for specific unsubsidized jobs	1
	Ability to get along with others	1
	Work ethic	1
	Availability	1
	State merit requirements	1
2	Grievance procedures	1
	Location	1
3	Physical capabilities	1
	Upward and lateral mobility	1
	Affirmative action	1
	Probationary period	1
	Nepotism	1
4	Trends, projections	1
	Chronological, seasonal	1
	Number of job openings	1
	Reasons for lay-offs	1
	Probationary status	1
5	Part-time	1
6	Experience or education requirements	1
	Qualifications	1
	New technology	1
	D.O.T. code	1
7	Job renewal requirement	1
8	Ratio number of jobs/work force	1
	National	1
9	Projected growth rate	1
10	Supervision level	1
	Spouse employed	1
	Primary/secondary employment position	1
	Days absent from work	1

continued -

STATE AND LOCAL:
OTHER ELEMENTS NEEDED BY AGENCIES (N=79)

CATEGORY	ELEMENT REQUESTED	FREQUENCY
11	Spouse occupation	1
12	Career goal	1
	Spouse occupation	1
	Number and frequency of employment interviews	1
	Willingness to take full-time, part-time training	1
13	How long underemployed	1
14	S.I.C. number	21
	Number workers by occupation	9
	Projected demand	2
	Total payroll	1
	Taxable payroll	1
	Employment by month	3
	U.I. tax rate	1
	U.I. contributions	1
	Productor service	5
	Unionized	1
	Profit/non-profit	1
	Government: Federal/State/Local	1
	Major skills required	5
	Person responsible for hiring	8
	Hiring dates for new personnel	1
	Operating hours of business	2
	Pay scale	1
	Fringe benefits	1
	Number of full-time/part-time employees	1
15	Career goal	1
	Type discharge	3
	Linguistic ability	1
	G.I. bill eligibility	1
	Branch of service	1
	Salary level	2
16	Foreign degree programs	1
17	Financial problems	1
continued -		

STATE AND LOCAL:
OTHER ELEMENTS NEEDED BY AGENCIES (N=79)

CATEGORY	ELEMENT REQUESTED	FREQUENCY
18	Foreign degree programs	1
	Number not furthering education	1
19	Mobility across and within occupations	1
20	Household composition	2
	Total population	1
	Marital status	1
21	Military base proximity	1
	Significant government employment	1
	Academic facilities proximity	1
22	Sales tax rate	1
23	Placement success	1
	Initial salaries of those placed	1
	Career goals of participatns	1
	Target groups	1
	Program cancellations	1
	Positive/negative terminations	2
	Length of training program	2
	Transferred credit applicability	1
	Start-up date	1
24	Turbulance of placements	1
	Positive/negative terminations	1
	Follow-up date	1

Section IV - AVAILABLE LABOR MARKET INFORMATION MATCHED TO NEED

This section deals with the identified available labor market information matched to data category and the specific data elements under each category.

The availability of labor market data was assessed across the same five agencies surveyed in the needs assessment: Vocational Education, Community Colleges, CETA, Employment Security, and Vocational Rehabilitation. Both State and local level offices were visited for each agency type. An attempt was made to identify the data holdings of each agency visited which are related to the categories and elements contained in the questionnaire. The search for the documentation of available information utilized the data element as the target of investigation.

The usual situation facing a searcher for specific data elements of labor market information is to locate data through publications that serve as guides to finding the data in source documents. The source document must then be searched for a particular data element. It is the intent of this study to depart from the traditional approach which makes easy access to needed labor market data difficult.

The NCSOICC collection and recording approach in this study provides flexibility in the manner in which data is accessed.

Data elements are indexed both by agency type and level and by the twenty-four categories and associated elements used in the needs assessment. Those elements which are required for Federal reports are identified. (These data elements required for Federal reports are available from the same agencies in other States and from all agencies of the same type within North Carolina.) Finally, there is a Catalogue of Data Holdings to facilitate the location of information on source documents, the original sources for documented data elements. (Pages 195 - 203)

Procedures

All North Carolina SOICC signatory agencies were included in the survey. Local level agencies included in the survey were selected by means of a sampling plan. Three sites for each of the five agency types were included. The fifteen sites were distributed across (1) the three geographic regions of the State, (2) urban and rural counties, and (3) minority and non-minority populations. Nine of North Carolina's seventeen planning regions were encompassed by the survey. The local sites included:

	SITE	CITY	COUNTY	SMSA	PLANNING REGION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
1.	Vocational Rehabilitation	Greenville	Pitt	No	Q	Coastal Plains

	SITE	CITY	COUNTY	SMSA	PLANNING REGION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
2.	Vocational Rehabilitation	Fayetteville	Cumberland	Yes	M	Coastal Plains
3.	Vocational Rehabilitation	Black Mt.	Buncombe	Yes	B	Mountain
4.	Employment Security	Wilson	Wilson	No	L	Coastal Plains
5.	Employment Security	Winston-Salem	Forsyth	Yes	G	Piedmont
6.	Employment Security	Asheville	Buncombe	Yes	B	Mountain
7.	CETA	Fayetteville	Cumberland	Yes	M	Coastal Plains
8.	CETA	Henderson	Vance	No	K	Piedmont
9.	CETA	Asheville	Buncombe	Yes	B	Mountain
10.	Technical Institute	Lumberton	Robeson	No	N	Coastal Plains
11.	Technical Institute	Clyde	Haywood	No	A	Mountain
12.	Technical Institute	Wilson	Wilson	No	L	Coastal Plains
13.	Vocational Education	Winston-Salem	Forsyth	Yes	G	Piedmont
14.	Vocational Education	Jefferson	Ashe	No	D	Mountain
15.	Vocational Education	Lumberton	Robeson	No	N	Coastal Plains

In addition, all five State agency offices were visited in Raleigh.

The documentation protocol consisted of sequential visits to the five State agency offices followed by the fifteen local sites. For State offices, two visits were made. At the first visit, published reports and data collection forms were obtained. The reports and forms were reviewed and a follow-up visit was scheduled to clear up questions. Since many forms documented at the State level consisted of reporting forms submitted by local offices, local offices received only one visit with follow-ups conducted by phone or mail. The sequence of visits permitted the interviewer to become familiar with standard reporting forms prior to interviewing local personnel. Interviews with local office personnel thus emphasized special agency holdings or collection activities. The number of elements documented per agency is as follows:

AGENCY		NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS RELATED TO ELEMENTS	TOTAL
Community Employment	- State	105	
	- Local	48	153
Vocational Education	- State	79	
	- Local	23	102
Community Colleges	- State	44	
	- Local	118	162
Vocational Rehabilitation			
	- State	34	
	- Local	12	46
Employment Security	- State	624	
	- Local	24	648
Total Number of Source and Element Documents			1,111

Three forms were developed to facilitate the documentation of labor market information. They are: (1) Source Documentation Form - Table 1, page 185, (2) Element Documentation Form for Aggregate Elements - Table 2, pages 187-8, and (3) Element Documentation Form for Unitary Elements - Table 3, page 190. These forms will be discussed later.

There are 1,111 Source and Element Documentation Forms that that are not included and published as part of this Final Report. They make possible the exact location in the documents of the particular relevant factual information for the various specific data elements. Due to their unmanageable size for binding purposes, they cannot be included herein. However, a reproduction of the documentation forms is available for those individuals who desire more specific and detailed information about data sources. This appears in a printing titled Source Records of Labor Market Data from North Carolina SOICC Signatory Agencies: 1978. This is available from the North Carolina SOICC by writing to:

Cari Whittington
North Carolina SOICC
Department of Administration
Room 218 Howard Building
112 W. Lane St.
Raleigh, N.C. 27611

A copy of Source Records will be sent at the price of payment of the cost of printing and postage.

(1) Source Documentation Form

The purpose of Table 1 is to provide detailed information about each of the existing Federal, State and local sources of labor market information used by the five State agencies. Specific tables in published reports or in standard collections of localized labor market data served as the sources for documentation. Each source was documented once even though it may have provided numerous data elements. The first item in the Source Documentation Form serves as the identification title of the data described in the form. (See page 191 for a description of the classification system developed as a code for the data in the Source and Element Documentation Forms.) The second item, type of measurement, provides a statistically oriented description of the type of data to be found in the source document. Here quantitative data is classified in terms of (1) frequency, (2) proportion, (3) mean, or (4) median. If the source data was qualitative in nature, this was noted under (5) other. Also, if the source contained unitary elements derived from other records, this was noted under (5) other.

The third item, geographic coverage, reflects the extent of the coverage of the data elements, eg. State, county, city, etc. A table containing a data element for every county in the State is listed as State coverage. A table prepared for a particular county is listed as county coverage.

The fourth item on the Source Documentation Form, frequency of collection provides eight categories to indicate the intervals between data collection. Both the frequency of collection categories and the geographic coverage categories parallel those included on the needs assessment questionnaire. This structure provides for direct comparisons of available and desired scope of geographic coverage and frequency of collection.

The fifth item, earliest date of accessibility, refers to the earliest collected data which may be recovered and put to some future use. This is not necessarily synonymous with the date that the information was first collected. The sixth item, the method of collection, refers to the extent of coverage that may be inferred from a data element (i.e. sample survey or universe).

The seventh item lists the type of agency and level (State or local) where the source document was obtained. The name of the particular agency site visited was not included for two reasons. One was to focus attention on a statewide profile of availability rather than to call attention to exemplary agency practices. Secondly, the omission of the agency name provided confidentiality to local respondents. The year of publication was also omitted to focus on the general cross-section of data that could be anticipated to be available for any particular year. The source of origin was included where the documented data was from a secondary source or where the provision of the status of the information supplier would be helpful in assessing the credibility of such information. Finally, the eighth item, limitations, details any caveats regarding

Table 1 - SOURCE DOCUMENTATION FORM

SOURCE DOCUMENTATION (REPORT/FORM IDENTIFICATION):

TYPE OF MEASUREMENT:

__ FREQUENCY
__ PROPORTION
__ MEAN
__ MEDIAN
__ OTHER (SPECIFY)

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE:

__ STATE
__ PLANNING REGION
__ COUNTY
__ SMSA
__ CITY
__ SCHOOL DISTRICT
__ SERVICE AREA
__ OTHER (SPECIFY)

FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION:

__ DAILY
__ WEEKLY
__ MONTHLY
__ QUARTERLY
__ BIANNUALLY
__ ANNUALLY
__ QUINQUENNIALLY
__ DECENNIALLY
__ OTHER (SPECIFY)

EARLIEST DATE OF ACCESSIBILITY:

METHOD OF COLLECTION:

__ SAMPLE SURVEY
__ UNIVERSE

COLLECTION AGENCY:
NAME:
AGENCY TYPE:
AGENCY LEVEL:
SOURCE OF ORIGIN (AGENCY/TITLE OF PERSON, FORMS/RECORDS):

LIMITATIONS:

the reliability of the data. For example, the geographic coverage of an element may not provide reliable estimates for sub-State areas of the definition of an element may exclude certain population sub-groups. The topics included in the Source Documentation Form include those that would apply to all elements documented from that source. Information items germane to particular data elements were included on the Element Documentation Forms.

(2) Element Documentation Form for Aggregate Elements

The two-page Element Documentation Form is presented in Table ?, pages 187-8. It is used to document all data elements except those obtained from individual records or forms. A description of each data element contains the following information:

1. Element number: An alpha-numeric identifier. The two letters on the extreme lift indicate the agency which was the source (i.e. VE = Vocational Education; VR = Vocational Pehabilitation; CC = Community Colleges; CT = Community Employment; ES = Employment Security). The next letter indicates the level of the agency (S = State; L = Local). The numbers on the right indicate the category and element from the needs assessment which provide the closest match with the documented data element. The number to the left of the decimal indicates the data category (1-24) and the number to the right of the decimal indicates the element within that category.

2. Title: A brief identification of the data element.

3. Description: A brief definition of the data element; included only where needed for clarity.

4. Source Documentation: The identifying title or number of the source document. This provides reference back to the Source Documentation Form for additional information.

5. Used For Federal Reporting Requirements: This item is checked if the element is used by the agency for federal reporting purposes.

6. Status of Element: This applies to quantitative data elements. A check indicates whether the element is enumerated or computed. Where some formula has been used to compute the element, a brief description of the derivative is provided.

7. Key Definitions: These definitions are related to the description of the data element. For example, the data element 'number employed by establishment' would include a definition of establishment under "key definitions".

8. Limitations: This contains any caveats regarding the reliability of the particular data element. It is used where there were limitations in addition to those listed

Table 2 - ELEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM - Page A

FOR AGGREGATE ELEMENTS

ELEMENT #:

TITLE:

DESCRIPTION:

SOURCE DOCUMENTATION (REPORT/FORM IDENTIFICATION):

USED FOR FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ___

STATUS OF ELEMENT: ___ ENUMERATED ___ COMPUTED

IF DERIVED, FORMULA/SOURCE OF INFORMATION:

KEY DEFINITIONS:

LIMITATIONS:

Table 2 - ELEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM - Page B

FOR AGGREGATE ELEMENTS

CLASSIFICATIONS:	AGENCY TERMINOLOGY	CATEGORIES
__ INDUSTRY		
__ OCCUPATIONAL CLUSTER		
__ OCCUPATION		
__ EMPLOYER		
__ STATE		
__ SMSA		
__ MULTI-COUNTY PLANNING REGION		
__ COUNTY		
__ CITY		
__ SCHOOL DISTRICT		
__ AGE		
__ SEX		
__ RACE		
__ EDUCATION LEVEL		
__ INCOME LEVEL		
__ LTD ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY		
__ MIGRANT, SEASONAL FARMWORKERS		
__ OFFENDER STATUS		
__ MENTALLY RETARDED		
__ PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED		
__ LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION STATUS		
__ VETERAN STATUS		
__ ACTIVE MILITARY STATUS		
__ HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD		
__ URBAN/RURAL STATUS		
__ EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED		
__ WELFARE RECIPIENTS		
__ FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD		
__ FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS		
__ OLD AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS		
__ UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (U.I.) CLAIMANT		
__ OTHER		

on the Source Documentation Form as being applicable to all data elements documented from that source.

9. Classifications: The second page of the form contains a listing of descriptors used to describe the data element. The listing contains the most common descriptors. The applicable ones are checked and additional ones listed under "Other". Each descriptor is accompanied by a breakdown of the categories included. For example, the descriptor race may contain the categories black, white, and other. Agency terminology is included if different than the listed descriptor. For example, an agency may use the term ethnic group rather than race.

(3) Element Documentation Form for Unitary Elements

This one page Element Documentation Form for Unitary Elements is presented in Table 3, page 190. The form contains all the data elements available from a particular individual record. If an individual student record contained the item race, "race" is then an element and is documented on the one-page unitary form. All other items on the one-page form are defined exactly as they were for the two-page form.

No assumptions were made during documentation about the presumed availability of data elements. Data elements were always documented as they appeared in the source.

This rule of protocol becomes particularly important in understanding how unitary elements were handled. For example, if race were listed on an individual client record, the resulting data element would be "race of agency client." The data element "number of agency clients by race" could be obtained if the records were aggregated, but again the documentation process made no assumptions about the availability of potential aggregation capabilities.

By treating the two types of elements separately, it is possible to distinguish between aggregate data elements which are available only as they appear. (For example, number of clients by race is an instance of the first type.) This can be distinguished from unitary data elements which are capable of being aggregated in various combinations. (For example, number of clients by sex by race is an instance of the second type.) However unitary data elements are often not obtainable if elements appear in aggregate form.

A Catalogue of Data Holdings

One question agency personnel ask about labor market information is, "Where do I find it?" In spite of Federal - State efforts to provide labor market information, there remain deficiencies that inhibit its usefulness. There are many publications

Table 3 - ELEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM

FOR UNITARY ELEMENTS

ELEMENT #:

TITLE:

DESCRIPTION:

SOURCE DOCUMENTATION (REPORT/FORM IDENTIFICATION):

USED FOR FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ___

STATUS OF ELEMENT: __ ENUMERATED __ COMPUTED

IF DERIVED, FORMULA/SOURCE OF INFORMATION:

KEY DEFINITIONS:

LIMITATIONS:

which serve as guides to locating data by directing the reader to additional publications.[1]

To enhance accessibility, this study provides "A Catalogue of Data Holdings" (See pgs. 195-203) to guide the user to specific data elements in addition to general publications. The voluminous information contained on the Element and Source Documentation Forms has been organized into a manageable catalogue. The user can locate information about a specific data element in order to access the document or individual source form which contains the needed element.

The matching process presented in "A Catalogue of Data Holdings" establishes crosswalks between the generalized data categories and specific data elements on the one hand and the documented information found in each agency on the other. To facilitate the linkage process a classification system was developed. This alphanumeric classification system was implemented by cataloging available data information according to the structure developed in the needs questionnaire.

This makes it possible to trace each documented data element to the originating agency at the State or local level and also identifies the match of the documented information to the data category and specific data element. Also, of course, this makes it possible to carry forward the process of updating the information as need arises.

This classification system consists of a code described as follows. For example:

ES-S-2.4

The first two letters indicate the agency from which the data element was obtained, in this case the Employment Security Commission. (The agency descriptors used are: VE = Vocational Education; VR = Vocational Rehabilitation; CC = Community Colleges; CT = Community Employment/(CETA); and, ES = Employment Security). The third letter of the identifier indicates whether the agency was a State (S) or local (L) level respondent.

---

[1] For example:

(a) Catalog of Publications and Releases of the Bureau of Employment Security Research. Raleigh, N.C.: Bureau of Employment Security Research, 1977.

(b) North Carolina Statistical Guide. Raleigh, N.C.: N.C. Department of Administration, 1976.

(c) Directory of Non-federal Statistics for State and Local Areas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970.

In the example given above, it is evident that it is a State level source. The next item found in the above example is the number two which indicates that this information is useful for category "2" - which is "Characteristics of 'typical' job". The number following the decimal in this example is "4" which specifies the fourth specific data element within category "2" - which is "Working conditions and hours".

The example discussed here is the fifth item in "A Catalogue of Data Holdings" which is identified in the second column as being a document titled State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary. In the next three columns in the catalogue one can learn that the data in the document in this instance is not collected for federal reporting requirements, that the frequency of the data collection is monthly, and, that the data in the document relates to the geographic area of SMSA and State.

General Overview of Available Labor Market Information Matched to Need

Readers should not be dismayed at the number of data elements which are listed in this study as being unavailable. Data collection efforts might be expanded by identifying additional information in the surveyed agencies or in other agencies, employers, personnel associations, etc. which may be collecting some needed data elements. A user consortium for an occupational information system might be expanded for this purpose. Some readers may be confused by elements listed as unavailable if they know of existing data which could fill the need. For example, specific instances in which this might occur is with categories sixteen and eighteen, ie. the number of completers/leavers and enrollees of education and training programs.

Like the assessment of need, the match of need and availability provides an opportunity to gain a perspective that cuts across agencies. It is possible to compare available data across agencies and to access common needs for data not readily available.

A general appraisal of how well the information currently collected actually matches the need for such information would note that some information was available for nineteen of the twenty-four categories. Those categories for which information was not available include four categories which received the lowest priority ratings; joining this group is the category titled occupational mobility. The occupational mobility category ranked nineteenth in the priority ratings. The absence of data for which there was low need supports the conclusion that agencies generally do not collect low priority information.

Data available from State offices of the various agencies can be assumed to be available statewide. However, as data for local offices was documented for only a sample of each agency type, it cannot be inferred that the same data would be available at other local offices of that type statewide. Additionally, data documented for local agencies is often of a localized nature and would not be useful on a statewide basis. This is not to indicate that localized data is of no value. On the contrary, the provision of specific localized information to support more general statewide information is essential for adequate planning at the local level. Unfortunately, most localized information is in the form of special surveys performed on an ad hoc basis. Two data categories, (characteristics of workers customarily hired and employment patterns,) had only localized data available. Therefore, elements documented for these categories are listed as not adequate due to their limited availability.

Twelve of the nineteen categories for which data was available had some information collected as frequently as desired. This supports the conclusion that data is both available and desired at a frequency interval that may be considered reasonable. The geographic coverage desired was determined by selecting the smallest geographic area desired for State and local agencies. Coverage at the school district level was desired by both State and local agencies for all categories matched to available data, with the exception of two data categories which State agencies desired county coverage. This was not any one agency requesting smaller geographic area coverage. It generally reflects the desires of three or more agencies out of the five. The available data does not meet this standard. This supports the conclusions that expectations for the geographic coverage of available data will have to be revised or that data will have to be provided on a smaller scale.

Each agency surveyed had data available for several category needs. However, documented data included information which the agency obtained from a secondary source (e.g., N. C. Department of Administration; N. C. Department of Commerce). In the implementation of an occupational information system, it would be desirable to go to the primary source to obtain data.

Many caveats are in order regarding the extent of information available for the twenty-four data categories and the specific data elements. For example, the assessment of availability, like the needs assessment, covered only five agencies. Information defined as available is limited to the public sector, and in particular the agencies surveyed in this study. For instance, category seventeen shows information available on the number of completers and leavers of education and training programs who are employed. This does not include private schools, private employer training programs, and so forth. The relevant data availability is therefore limited by the scope of this study.

This general appraisal should note the finding that some highly needed data categories were missing some elements and other highly needed categories contained data elements which were not currently available. Some highly needed categories require extensive information from private employers. Some information for categories one and three has resulted from special surveys done by local agencies with voluntary cooperation from employers.

Information which is available but does not meet agency requirements in terms of frequency of collection or geographic coverage presents another collection problem. Like the needs assessment, the documentation of data availability provides useful perspective on each of the five agencies. It allows agencies the opportunity to compare the data they have with what is available from other agencies. It sheds light on commonalities and differences in data collection activities. Finally, it increases the understanding of what a shared occupational information system might be.

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

ID #	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
VE-L-1.7	Local Survey of Opportunities for Graduates		Special Survey	County
ES-S-2.1	*Wage Rates and Weekly Earnings*		Fall of Odd Years	State
ES-S-2.2	*North Carolina Insured Employment and Wage Payments*		Annually	State
	State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary		Monthly	SMSA, State
	Wage Rates and Weekly Earnings		Fall of Odd Years	Three Major Regions
ES-L-2.2				
ES-S-2.4	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA, State
ES-S-2.12	*Fringe Benefit Practices in Manufacturing Industries*		Special 1974	State
ES-L-2.12	Wage and Fringe Benefit Survey		Special Survey	Industry
ES-L-2.13	Wage and Fringe Benefit Survey		Special Survey	Industry
CC-L-3.4	*Employer Survey*		Special Survey	County
VR-L-3.6	Job Possibilities		As Available	V.R. Region
ES-S-4.1	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA, State
ES-S-4.2	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA, State
	Unpublished Form #DL1219		Monthly - Confidential Information	Establishment
ES-S-4.3	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA, State
ES-S-4.4	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA: State

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID #	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
ES-S-4.5	Unpublished Form #DL1219		Monthly - Confidential Information	Establishment
	State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary		Monthly	SMSA; State
ES-S-4.6	*State Labor Summary: Labor Area Summary*		Monthly	SMSA; State
	Unpublished Form #DL1219		Monthly - Confidential Information	Establishment
ES-S-4.7	Unpublished Form #DL1219		Monthly - Confidential Information	Establishment
ES-S-5.1	*N. C. Preliminary Civilian Labor Force Estimates Annual Planning Report*		Annual	SMSA
	Employment Security Trends		Monthly	State
	N.C. Insured Employment and Wage Payments		Quarterly	State
	Employment Projections to 19XX-SMSA		Biennially	SMSA
	Occupational Employment		Every 3 years	State
	State Labor Summary		Monthly	State
	Unpublished Form #BLS-ETA-2877.220-0 OES Survey		Monthly	Establishment
	Unpublished Form #BLS-790		Monthly	Establishment
ES-S-5.3	*North Carolina Insured Employment and Wage Payments Annual Planning Report*		Annual	SMSA
	State Labor Summary		Monthly	State
	Unpublished Form #NCUI-101		Quarterly	State/Employer
	Unpublished Form #BLS-790		Monthly	Establishment

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
ES-S-6.1	ESARS - Table 7B		Quarterly	ES Local Office
CT-S-6.1	North Carolina Balance of States Annual Plan	X	Annual	MCPR
ES-L-6.1	Job Order Form #NCSES-514		Per Order	Local Office
ES-S-6.2	ESARS - Table 7A		Quarterly	ES Local Office
	Employment Security Trends			
	State Labor Summary		Monthly	State
	Registered Applicants and Non-Agricultural Job Openings By Occupational Grouping			
	Annual Planning Report		Monthly	SMSA
CT-S-6.2	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annual	MCPR
CT-S-6.6	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annual	MCPR
ES-L-6.6	Job Bank Control: Index Update Form #NCSES-2156		Daily	Local Office
ES-L-6.13	Job Order Form #NCSES-514		Per Order	Local Office
ES-S-7.1	North Carolina Employment		Biennially	State
	Projections to 19XY-SMSA		Biennially/ Quinquennially	State/SMSA
ES-S-7.2	Projections to 19XY-SMSA		Biennially/ Quinquennially	State/SMSA
ES-S-7.3	Labor Supply and Demand Projections to 19XY-SMSA		Biennially/ Quinquennially	State/SMSA
	Annual Planning Report		Annually	SMSA
	Employment Projections to 19XX-MCPR		Biennially	Planning Regions
CC-L-7.3	Employer Survey		Special Survey	County

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
ES-S-8.1	Annual Planning Report			
	North Carolina Preliminary Civilian Labor Force Estimates			
	Employment Security Trends			
CT-S-8.1	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annually	NCPR
VE-L-8.1	Regional Information System		Decennially	County
ES-S-8.2	North Carolina Preliminary Civilian Labor Force Estimates		Monthly	State
	Annual Planning Report		Annually	SMSA and CETA Prime Sponsor Jurisdiction
CT-S-8.2	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annually	MCPR
VE-S-8.2	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
CT-S-8.3	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annually	Bal. of State
ES-S-8.3	Employment Security Trends		Monthly	State
	Continuous Wage Benefit History Survey	X	N/A	By Claimant
ES-S-9.1	Employment Security Trends		Monthly	State
	North Carolina Preliminary Civilian Labor Force Estimates		Monthly	State
	State Labor Summary		Monthly	State
	Area Labor Market Newsletter		Monthly	State, Planning Regions, County SMSA, Labor Area
	North Carolina Labor Force Estimates			
	Active Job Applicants Registered For Work With ESC Offices		Quarterly	State
CT-S-9.1	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.	X	Annually	State
VE-L-9.1	Regional Information System		Decennially	County
VE-S-9.1	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
ES-S-9.1	Registered Applicants and Non-Agricultural Job Openings by Occupational Grouping		Quarterly	State
	Annual Planning Report		Annually	SMSA
	Manpower Information For Affirmative Action Programs		Monthly	State, County, SMSA
	Labor Supply and Demand		Special One-time Study	State, SMSA
	Characteristics of the Active Applicants Registered for Work With ESC Offices		Special Report	State
	ESARS - Table 93		Quarterly	County
	ESARS - Table 96		Quarterly	State
VE-S-9.2	NC State Plan for Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
ES-S-9.2	Annual Planning Report		Decennially	SMSA
ES-S-9.3	Unpublished Form #NCSES-511		Per Client	Per Client - ES Local Office
VE-S-9.3	NC State Plan for Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
ES-S-10.1	ESARS			
ES-S-10.2	Annual Planning Report		Decennially	County, SMSA
ES-S-10.5	ESARS			
ES-S-10.6	ESARS		Monthly	State
ES-S-10.10	Employment Security Trends - Table 3A		Quarterly	State
	ESARS - Table 3B		Quarterly	State
	ESARS - Table 3C,D		Monthly	State
	ESARS - Table 15A,B,C,D		Quarterly (A,B) and Monthly (C,D)	State
	ESARS - Table 17		Monthly	State

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
ES-S-10.10	ESARS - Table 9 (A,B)		Quarterly	ES Local Office
	ESARS - Table 4		Monthly	State
	ESARS - Table 4A		Quarterly	State
	ESARS - Table 4 (C,D)		Monthly	State
ES-S-11.1	Manpower Information For Affirmative Action Programs		Decennially	State, County, SMSA
ES-S-11.6	Labor Area Summary	X	Monthly	SMSA
	Employment Security Trends		Monthly/ Weekly	State
	ESARS - Table 8		Monthly	State
	Weekly Report of Claimstaking Activities		Weekly	State
ES-S-11.1	Weekly Report of Claimstaking Activities		Weekly	State
ES-S-14.0	North Carolina Insured Employment and Wage Payments		Annually	State
	Annual Planning Report		Annually	SMSA
CC-S-14.0	Directory of NC Employers Educational Institutions, 1973-74		N/A	State
VE-S-16.5	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
VE-S-16.16	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
CC-L-17.1				
CT-S-17.1				
CT-S-17.2	Unpublished Form #DCE 302		Per Client	CETA Project
VE-S-17.2	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-6	X	Annually	Institution
CC-L-17.2	Unpublished Form #DCE 13-10		By Student 3,6,12 mos. after leaving school	Institution
	Alumni Study		Same as Above	Same as Above

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
CC-L-17.3	Unpublished Form #DCC 13-10		By Student 3,6,12 mos. after leaving school	Institution
	Occupational Graduate Employment Report		Biennially	Institution
	Follow-up Student Survey		By Student 3,6,12 mos. after leaving school	Institution
CT-S-17.3				
CT-S-17.4				
CC-L-17.4				
CC-L-17.6	Unpublished Form #DCC 13-10		By Student 3,6,12 mos. after leaving school	Institution
CT-S-17.6	Unpublished Form #DCE 302		Per Client	CETA Project
VE-S-17.6	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-6	X	Annually	Institution
VE-L-17.6	Regional Information System		Annually	County
CC-L-17.6	Follow-up Student Survey		By Student 3,6,12 mos. after leaving school	Institution
	Alumni Study		Same	Same
	Unpublished Form #DCC 13-9		By Student At Exit	Institution
CC-S-18.1	Unpublished Institution's End-Of-Quarter Class Report: #DCC 7-3		Quarterly	Institution

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
VE-L-18.4	Regional Information System		Annually	County
VE-L-18.5	Regional Information System		Annually	Institution
VE-S-18.5	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-6	X	Annually	Institution
	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-7		Semester	Institution
	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
CC-S-18.7	Unpublished Institution's End-Of-Quarter Class Report: #DCC 7-3		Quarterly	Institution
CT-S-18.10	North Carolina Balance of States A.P.		Annually	Balance of State
	Unpublished Form #DCE 402	X	Quarterly	Project Area
VE-S-18.16	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
VE-L-20.2	Regional Information System		Decennially	County
CT-L-20.2	Needs Assessment Report		Decennially (by Census)	MCPR
VE-L-20.4	Regional Information System		Decennially	County
VE-L-20.11	Regional Information System		Decennially	County
VE-S-20.11	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
CT-S-20.11	North Carolina Balance of State A.P.		Annually	State
CT-L-20.11	Needs Assessment Report		Monthly, Annually	County, MCPR
ES-S-20.11	North Carolina Insured Employment and Wage Payments		Annually	State
ES-S-21.4	Announced New and Expanding Manufacturing Firms		Monthly	State
ES-S-21.5	Announced New and Expanding Manufacturing Firms		Monthly	State
VE-S-21.11	NC State Plan For Vocational Education	X	Annually	State
VE-S-23.1	Vocational Education Program of Studies; Div. of Vocational Education, DPI	X	N/A	State
	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-7		Semester	Institution

A CATALOGUE OF DATA HOLDINGS

By Category and Element Across Agencies

(Continued)

ID#	DOCUMENT	FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION	GEOGRAPHIC AREA
CC-S-23.1	Educational Guide, NC Community Colleges, Technical Institutes		Biennailly	State
CC-S-23.2	Educational Guide, NC Community Colleges, Technical Institutes		Biennially	State
VE-S-23.2	Vocational Education Program of Studies; Div. of Vocational Education, DPI		N/A	State
VE-S-23.4	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-7		Semester	Institution
CC-S-23.4	Educational Guide; NC Community Colleges, Technical Institutes		Biennially	State
	Directory of NC Employers and Educational Institutes		N/A	State
	Unpublished Institutions End-Of-Quarter Class Report: DCC 7-3		Quarterly	Institution
CC-S-23.7	Unpublished Institutions End-Of-Quarter Class Report: DCC 7-3	X	Quarterly	Institution
VE-S-23.7	Unpublished Report #OE-RS-6	X	Annually	Institution
CT-S-23.7	Unpublished Form #DCE 402		Special Project	Special Project-BOS
VR-S-24.4	Help for North Carolina's Disabled From VRS		As Available	State
VR-L-24.5	Compiled Data on R-11 Closures		Special Report	VR Region

Section V - ANALYSIS OF UNDOCUMENTED AGENCY NEEDS

The purpose of this section is to identify those specific data elements for which no data source was found. The structure of the needs assessment questionnaire was used to organize the matching process. Each item of information documented was matched to one of the twenty-four data categories in the questionnaire. It was then matched as closely as possible to a data element within that data category. Having matched available data elements with need, it was then possible to determine those elements for which no corresponding information was found.

A sine qua non decision which preceeded the detailed matching was the determination of which data categories were needed. As discussed in Section III, each category was given an importance rating by each agency and these were ranked across agencies to determine need. All twenty-four categories were needed to some degree and every category was considered by at least one agency to be of above average need. In addition, every element included under the data categories was needed by some percentage of both State and local agencies with the exception of the millage assessment under fiscal information, which was not needed by any State agency. A preliminary decision was made to consider all data categories and elements (with the exception of millage assessment) as needed. This decision was not intended to dictate the content of the eventual system, but was necessary as a procedural device to facilitate the match. The result is a comparison of available data with needed data. This results in a table entitled "Specific Data Elements By Category For Which No Information Was Documented During Data Availability Interviews" (Page 205).

The following analysis focuses on specific data elements which were identified as needed but for which no information was documented to be available during the data availability interviews which were conducted by Sally Brower of CONSERVA, Inc. The table is arranged by data category. Following the category number appear the numbers of the specific data elements for which no information was documented.

SPECIFIC DATA ELEMENTS BY CATEGORY FOR WHICH NO INFORMATION WAS DOCUMENTED DURING DATA AVAILABILITY INTERVIEWS

CATEGORY	SPECIFIC DATA ELEMENTS
1	1,2,3,4,5,6,8
2	3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11
3	1,2,3
4	7
5	All Needs Met
6	3,4,5
7	All Needs Met
8	All Needs Met
9	All Needs Met
10	3,4,7,8
11	2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10
12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
13	1,2,3
14	Information Adequate But Not Available*
15	1,2,3
16	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15
17	5
18	6,8,11,12,13,14,15
19	1,2,3
20	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10
21	2,3,6,7,8,9,10
22	1,2,3,4,5,6
23	3,5,6
24	1,2,3,6

* North Carolina Employment Security Commission files contain the names and addresses of over 120,000 employer establishments in North Carolina. There are legal restrictions on the release of this information.

RESULTS

I.   This North Carolina SOICC study makes possible a broadening of awareness of information sources and data availability for many directors of programs and services in the five State agencies. For example, Directors of Vocational Education programs now have a means by which they can become informed of the range of data holdings of the Employment Security Commission; Directors of CETA programs can now become informed about the data needs and holdings of Community Colleges and Technical Institutes; and, the Directors of Employment Security can now become aware of the data needs of CETA and Vocational Education program directors.

II.   The findings of this NCSOICC study and the experience gained in securing agency information provide the basis for establishing a North Carolina Multi-purpose Occupational Information System which will be operating statewide in 1980.

III. Appropriate SOICC officials in twenty-four other states have requested copies of the NCSOICC survey instrumentation to investigate and document the facts on user need and data availability of labor market information on a statewide basis in their own states.

IV.   This NCSOICC study revealed, for example, that "Job Openings", "Characteristics of Workers Customarily Hired", "Employment Patterns", and "Characteristics of 'Typical' Job", were the four data categories most needed; and, "Fiscal Information" and "Characteristics of Military Returnees" were the data categories least needed by State and local agencies in providing local labor market information.

V.   The investigation has created a list of user informational requirements prioritized according to user needs by State and local agencies.

VI.   This study presents "A Catalogue of Data Holdings" which constitutes an inventory of labor market data sources which has also been indexed according to the informational requirements of the specific data elements in the twenty-four generalized data categories.

VII. A Final Report is presented herein for dissemination which documents the problem addressed, the methodology used, the results obtained, and the uses resulting as outcomes of this NCSOICC study. Not included in this Final Report, but also available, is the complete set of source and element documentation forms reporting the 1,111 documents related to specific data elements that were identified and collected during interviews to determine State and local labor market information availability. (See page 183)

CONCLUSIONS

I. The North Carolina SOICC has successfully conducted the first statewide interagency investigation and study of data needs and data availability to assist in establishing the basis for the development of a multi-purpose occupational information system. This investigation has demonstrated that the essential cooperative relationships among state agencies can be established for the purpose of creating such a system.

II. The study revealed that one or more state agencies said that each of the twenty-four generalized data categories is needed and all the specific data elements are needed with the single exception of millage assessment. Therefore, it can be stated that the categories and specific data elements in the questionnaire proved to test out successfully in the judgment of experienced State and local agency officials as containing essential data elements for a multi-purpose occupational information system.

III. In the request for copies of the new survey instrumentation created for this study that have been received from twenty-four other states, and in the reports from various states about the use of these North Carolina SOICC data instruments, there is evidence that an important part of this study is transferable to and is of use in other states.

IV. This study has made possible interagency consultation and data reporting that lead to the agreement that it would be advantageous to work together to meet the common data needs of vocational education and manpower training programs.

V. This study provides in the data needs questionnaire, with its listing of twenty-four generalized data categories of labor market information and the specific data elements for each category, a means of securing an approximate measurement of the availability and usability of current labor market information.

VI. This study reports on the inadequacies of existing information and alerts state agencies to information needs.

VII. Future studies can up-date this 1977-78 report on occupational information needs on a systematic basis.

VIII. This study reveals problems in data collection, accessibility, and timeliness of up-dating that justify interagency cooperation through the North Carolina SOICC.

IX. This Final Report will be distributed to the Signatory Committee members of the North Carolina SOICC and to the members of the Technical Advisory Committee. Using this Final Report as the basic starting point, discussion directed toward identifying what data to include in the common core of a multi-purpose occupational information system can begin. It is the intention of the North Carolina SOICC that this will happen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ahamad, B. and M. Blaug, Editors. The Practice of Manpower Forecasting. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

2. Brown, D.G. Academic Labor Markets. Chapel Hill, 1965.

3. Brunner, K. and A.H. Meltzer, Editors. The Phillips Curve and Labor Markets. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company; New York: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1975.

4. Burtt, E.J. Labor Markets, Unions and Government Policies. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.

5. Cohen, Malcolm S. On the Feasibility of a Labor Market Information System. Vol. 1, Final Report Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, June 1974.

6. Daeringer, P.B. and M. Piore. Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath, 1971.

7. D.W. Drewes, et. al. Data Needs in Vocational Education. Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, 1976.

8. Ferber, R. Employers' Forecasts of Manpower Requirements: A Case Study. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1958.

9. Foltman, Felician F. Manpower Information for Effective Management. Part 2: Skills Inventories and manpower Planning. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1973.

10. Hansen, N.M. Improving Access to Economic Opportunity: Nonmetropolitan Labor Markets in an Urban Society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballenger Publishing Company, 1976.

11. Kalachek, E.D. Labor Markets and Unemployment. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

12. Kaufman, Roger A. Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

13. Kidder, David E. Review and Synthesis of Research on Manpower Forecasting for Vocational-Technical Education. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, February 1972.

14. Krimpas, C.E. Labor Input and the Theory of the Labor Market. New York: Wiley, 1975.

15. Lawson, R.S. Perspective on the Development of a Comphrhensive Labor Market Information System for Michigan. Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W.E. Upjohn Institute, 1965.

16. Lecht, Leonard A. Manpower Needs for National Goals in the 1970's. National Planning Association. New York, Washington, London: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1969.

17. Lester, R.A. Manpower Planning in a Free Society. Princeton University Press, 1966.

18. Levine, Louis L. Labor Market Information for Local Delivery of Manpower Services. Manpower Administration. Available from National Technical Information Service, Operations Division, Springfield, Firginia. PB221314/AS.

19. Levitan, Sar. A., Garth L. Mangum and Ray Marshall. Human Resources and Labor Markets. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

20. Levitan, Sar A., Garth L. Mangum, and Ray Marshall. Human Resources and Labor Markets in the American Economy. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

21. McCormick, B.J. and E.O. Smith, Editors. The Labor Market: Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

22. Morton, J.E. "Analytical Potential of the Current Population Survey for Manpower and Employment Research," Studies in Employment and Unemployment. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute, 1965.

23. National Commission for Manpower Policy, The Challenge of Rising Unemployment. Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: February, 1975.

24. Procedings of a Conference on Labor Market Information Systems: Information Needs, Sources and Methods of Delivery. Berkeley, California: University of California, Department of Industrial Engineering, November 1970.

25. Scoville, J.G. Manpower and Occupational Analysis: Concepts and Measurements. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1972.

26. Stevens, David W. Employment Projection for Planning Vocational-Technical Education Curricula: Mission Impossible? Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, January, 1976.

27. Thal-Larsen, Margaret, Stephen Laner, and Donald Mayall. Requirements and Design of a Labor Market Information System for a Large Metropolitan Area. Berkeley, California: Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, November 1972.

28. U.S. Congress. Education Amendments of 1976. Public Law 94-482, enacted October 12, 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

29. U.S. Congress. Senate. 95th Congress, 1st Session. S.B. 170 "Comprehensive Youth Employment Act of 1977," introduced on January 11, 1977.

30. Vincens, J. and D. Robinson. Research into Labour Market Behaviour. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1974.

31. Wikstrom, Walter S. Manpower Planning: Evolving Systems. Report 521. New York: The Conference Board, Inc., 1971.

32. Yavitz, Boris, Dean W. Morse, with Anna B. Dutka. The Labor Market: An Information System. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION

NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

Attached you will find twenty-four (24) sheets, each listing one generalized data category subdivided into specific exemplary data elements. The generalized data categories are broad categories descriptive of occupational and labor market information; they do not include other general information found in agency management systems. The specific data elements define and detail the generalized data categories, and include both qualitative and quantitative information.

The questionnaire provides two ways to describe agency information needs. The generalized data category provides a means for describing each of your data needs in terms of its relative importance, the desired level of specificity (e.g. by industry, by county, etc.), sub-populations on which the information is needed (e.g. "characteristics of unemployed" by age, by sex, etc.), the required currency of the data, the frequency of agency use, and the adequacy of existing data for satisfying the information need. The specific data elements provide a means for determining the composition of the needed data categories. With the exception of the importance ratings, the descriptors are presented in a check-off format to facilitate completion of the needs assessment instrument.

NOTE: Some of the survey response items will not be appropriate for all of the data categories. Please disregard those that are inappropriate (e.g. "fiscal information" by age; daily up-dates on "characteristics of workers customarily hired").

Please be sure to include all general information requested on the cover sheet including the names of the ad hoc assessment committee.

Survey No. ____

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION

NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

Place a check beside your agency level.

_____State
_____Local

Place a check beside your agency type.

_____Public Instruction
_____Community College
_____Community Development
_____Employment Security
_____Vocational Rehabilitation

Place a check beside the type of area served by your agency.

_____SMSA
_____Not SMSA
_____Entire State

Ad hoc assessment committee members:

____
Name Position

____
Name Position

____
Name Position

____
Name Position

____
Name Position

____
Name Position

December 1977

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(1) Characteristics of workers customarily hired. (Traits and qualities generally associated with employer acceptance)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Educational attainment*
____ *Skill level*
____ *Interest patterns*
____ *Physical capabilities*
____ *Work experience*
____ *Age*
____ *Training background*
____ *Licenses, accreditations, certificates held*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance		Agency Uses
0	No importance	____ Job placement
1	Below average importance	____ Program planning
2	Average importance	____ Program operations
3	Above average importance	____ Vocational or career counseling
4	Critical importance	____ Curriculum development
		____ Industrial recruitment
		____ Reporting requirements
		____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(2) Characteristics of 'typical' job (Usual work performed in selected occupations).*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Entry wage rates*
____ *Average wage rates*
____ *Duties and responsibilities*
____ *Working conditions and hours*
____ *Linkage with other jobs (promotions/transfers)*
____ *Hiring channels customarily used*
____ *Licenses, accreditations, certificates required*
____ *Length of tenure*
____ *Sources of labor supply customarily used*
____ *Apprenticeship opportunities*
____ *Training opportunities*
____ *Fringe benefits*
____ *Other (please specify)*

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0	No importance
1	Below average importance
2	Average importance
3	Above average importance
4	Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (3) *Employment patterns. (Information generally descriptive of employer hiring practices)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Seasonal/stable*
____ *Vacancies generally filled by new hires/promotions (transfers)*
____ *Temporary/permanent*
____ *Full-time/part-time*
____ *Consideration of special applicants (disabled, offenders, etc.)*
____ *Other (please specify)* ________________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (4) *Turnover statistics*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

___ *Accession rates (new hires & recalls)*
___ *Number of new hires*
___ *Number of recalls (re-hired)*
___ *Separation rates (quits, discharges, layoffs)*
___ *Number of quits*
___ *Number of lay-offs*
___ *Number of discharges*
___ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

___ Job placement
___ Program planning
___ Program operations
___ Vocational or career counseling
___ Curriculum development
___ Industrial recruitment
___ Reporting requirements
___ Other, please specify: _______

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

___ By industry
___ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
___ By occupation
___ By employer

___ By State
___ By SMSA
___ By Multi-county Planning Region
___ By County
___ By City
___ By School District

___ By Current estimates
___ By Short-term projections
___ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (5) *Total employment*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Number employed*
____ *Employment rate*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (6) *Job Openings (vacancies)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *By wage level*
____ *Number*
____ *Rate*
____ *Average length of time open*
____ *Reason for opening (expansion, quits, etc.)*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ________________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (7) *Employment Requirements*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

   ____ *Replacement needs*
   ____ *Expansion needs*
   ____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance		Agency Uses
0	No importance	____ Job placement
1	Below average importance	____ Program planning
2	Average importance	____ Program operations
3	Above average importance	____ Vocational or career counseling
4	Critical importance	____ Curriculum development
		____ Industrial recruitment
		____ Reporting requirements
		____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

   ____ By industry
   ____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
   ____ By occupation
   ____ By employer
   ____ By State
   ____ By SMSA
   ____ By Multi-county Planning Region
   ____ By County
   ____ By City
   ____ By School District
   ____ By Current estimates
   ____ By Short-term projections
   ____ By Long-term projections

283

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (8) *Unemployment statistics*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Number*
____ *Rate*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded.
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (9) *Labor force statistics*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Number in labor force*
____ *Participation rate*
____ *Other (please specify)* ________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(10) Characteristics of employed (Demographic characteristics of present labor force)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Employment status (full-time/part-time)*
____ *Commuting patterns*
____ *Licensed, certificated, etc.*
____ *Skill level*
____ *Education and training*
____ *Income (sources)*
____ *Number of weeks worked in last year*
____ *Work experience*
____ *Part-time/full-time*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance		Agency Uses
0	No importance	____ Job placement
1	Below average importance	____ Program planning
2	Average importance	____ Program operations
3	Above average importance	____ Vocational or career counseling
4	Critical importance	____ Curriculum development
		____ Industrial recruitment
		____ Reporting requirements
		____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ________________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (11) *Characteristics of unemployed*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Occupation (last job)*
____ *Earnings (last job)*
____ *Length of unemployment*
____ *Reason for separation*
____ *Recall status*
____ *U.I. claimants*
____ *Skill level*
____ *Education and training*
____ *Number of periods of unemployment*
____ *Income (sources)*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ________________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(12) Characteristics of discouraged workers (Those who are not actively seeking work because they believe they would not find employment)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Occupation (last job)*
____ *Earnings (last job)*
____ *Length of unemployment*
____ *Reason for separation*
____ *Skill level*
____ *Education and training*
____ *Number of periods of unemployment*
____ *Income (sources)*
____ *Other (please specify)*

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ________________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (13) *Characteristics of underemployed (Standard CETA definition)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Number working only part-time, seeking full-time*
____ *Number working full-time at or below poverty level*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (14) *Identification of employers (establishment name, address)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ________________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (15) *Characteristics of military returnees*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Skill level*
____ *Education and training*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(16) Number of completers/leavers by education and training programs*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Public certificate programs*
____ *Associate arts degree programs*
____ *Private certificate/associate degree programs*
____ *Public secondary general/academic programs*
____ *Public secondary vocational programs*
____ *Private secondary programs*
____ *Baccalaureate degree programs*
____ *Post-baccalaureate degree programs*
____ *Vocational rehabilitation programs*
____ *CETA programs*
____ *WIN programs*
____ *Community-based training programs*
____ *Apprenticeship programs*
____ *Private employer training programs*
____ *Union training programs*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (17) *Characteristics of completers/leavers by education and training programs.*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Reasons for leaving program*
____ *Number employed/unemployed*
____ *Type of employment by type of training*
____ *Wage rate of employed*
____ *Reasons for unemployment (in school, disabled, etc.)*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(18) Number of enrollees by education and training programs.*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Public certificate programs*
____ *Associate arts degree programs*
____ *Private certificate/associate degree programs*
____ *Public secondary general/academic programs*
____ *Public secondary vocational programs*
____ *Private secondary programs*
____ *Baccalaureate degree programs*
____ *Post-baccalaureate degree programs*
____ *Vocational rehabilitation programs*
____ *CETA programs*
____ *WIN programs*
____ *Community-based training programs*
____ *Apprenticeship programs*
____ *Private employer training programs*
____ *Union training programs*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(19) Occupational mobility (movement within occupation not due to geographic migration)*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Occupational transfers*
____ *Re-entrants into labor force*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (20) *Population characteristics*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Family size*
____ *Income of families and unrelated individuals*
____ *Household living costs*
____ *Mobility patterns (geographic movement)*
____ *Birth rates*
____ *Death rates by underlying cause*
____ *Fetal, infant, and neonatal death rates*
____ *Cases of communicable disease*
____ *Fertility patterns*
____ *Arrest rates*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped

____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates

____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: *(21) Economic Indicators*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Hours and earnings*
____ *Wholesale sales*
____ *Retail sales*
____ *New business starts*
____ *Business expansions*
____ *Residential construction permits*
____ *Non-residential construction permits*
____ *Plant closings*
____ *Product output of manufacturers (durables)*
____ *Product output of manufacturers (nondurables)*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance		Agency Uses
0	No importance	____ Job placement
1	Below average importance	____ Program planning
2	Average importance	____ Program operations
3	Above average importance	____ Vocational or career counseling
4	Critical importance	____ Curriculum development
		____ Industrial recruitment
		____ Reporting requirements
		____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (22) *Fiscal Information*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Assessed property valuation*
____ *Property tax collected*
____ *Milage assessment*
____ *Income tax collected*
____ *Sales tax collected*
____ *Public program expenditures by program*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0	No importance
1	Below average importance
2	Average importance
3	Above average importance
4	Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (23) *Education and training program characteristics*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Program title*
____ *Program description*
____ *Eligibility requirements*
____ *Identification of program providers (name, address)*
____ *Budget*
____ *Support services offered*
____ *Other (please specify)* ______________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance

0 No importance
1 Below average importance
2 Average importance
3 Above average importance
4 Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ______________________________

____

____

GENERALIZED DATA CATEGORY: (24) *Counseling and placement opportunities*

1. Check all the specific data elements that are needed by your agency.

____ *Program title*
____ *Program description*
____ *Eligibility requirements*
____ *Identification of program providers (name, address)*
____ *Volume of placements*
____ *Budget*
____ *Other (please specify)* ____________________

2. Rate the importance of the generalized data category for each use by placing a number from the rating scale in the blank beside each use. Please rate the importance of the generalized data category to your agency operations regardless of whether or not such information is currently available.

Scale of Importance	
0	No importance
1	Below average importance
2	Average importance
3	Above average importance
4	Critical importance

Agency Uses

____ Job placement
____ Program planning
____ Program operations
____ Vocational or career counseling
____ Curriculum development
____ Industrial recruitment
____ Reporting requirements
____ Other, please specify: ________

NOTE: If you feel this data category is of no importance for any purpose, go on to the next generalized data category.

3. Check all of the level(s) of specificity needed for the generalized data category listed at the top of this page.

____ By industry
____ By occupational cluster (occupations with similar competency and/or performance requirements)
____ By occupation
____ By employer

____ By State
____ By SMSA
____ By Multi-county Planning Region
____ By County
____ By City
____ By School District

____ By Current estimates
____ By Short-term projections
____ By Long-term projections

317

4. Check the descriptors of target (client) groups needed for the generalized data category. (Check only if appropriate).

____ By age
____ By sex
____ By race
____ By education level
____ By income level
____ By limited English-speaking ability
____ By migrant, seasonal farm workers
____ By offender status
____ By mentally retarded
____ By physically handicapped
____ By labor force participation status
____ By veteran status
____ By active military status
____ By head of household
____ By urban/rural status
____ By emotionally disturbed
____ By welfare recipients
____ By female head of household
____ By food stamp recipients
____ By old age assistance recipients
____ By Unemployment Insurance (U.I.) claimant

5. Check the desired currency of the generalized data category.

____ Daily updates
____ Weekly updates
____ Monthly updates
____ Quarterly updates
____ Biannual updates
____ Annual updates
____ Biennial updates

6. Check the frequency of use of the generalized data category for any purpose.

____ daily ____ weekly ____ monthly ____ quarterly ____ annual

7. Check the adequacy of available data for meeting the generalized data category need.

____ adequate ____ not adequate

Please comment on problems or inadequacies: ____________________

____

____

APPENDIX B - Part 1

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
RALEIGH 27611

JAMES B. HUNT, JR.
GOVERNOR

MEMORANDUM

TO: SELECTED STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY OFFICIALS

FROM: GOVERNOR HUNT

DATE: DECEMBER 6, 1977

SUBJECT: COMPREHENSIVE OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEM QUESTIONNAIRE

I am pleased to lend my support in the proposed development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System for the State of North Carolina. A major focus of my administration is the integration of labor force development with economic growth. The development of an expanded Occupational Information System will serve to integrate human resources development efforts with economic development policies.

I endorse the assessment of user need and data availability as a logical first step in the development of a multi-purpose occupational information system. It is my belief that agency cooperation in the initial stages of development will produce an information system that is invaluable in program planning, in resource allocation, and in strengthening agency communications.

I hope that you will complete the Information Needs Questionnaire, and later, if you are chosen, will participate in the interviews to ascertain agency data holdings.

Your support for this important effort is very much appreciated.

North Carolina
Department of Administration
Howard Building 112 West Lane Street Raleigh 27603

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor
Joseph W. Grimsley, Secretary

State Occupational Information
Coordinating Committee (SOICC)
Joyce F. Kinnison, Director
(919) 733-6700

6 December 1977

The North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NCSOICC) is directing a survey of labor market information needs across state and local agencies. The project is funded by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education and is being conducted by the Department of Administration and CONSERVA, Inc., a private research organization. The needs assessment is the first stage in the design and implementation of a state-wide comprehensive Occupational Information System that will serve the needs of State Boards and agencies, schools and community colleges, local education agencies, local employment security and vocational rehabilitation unit offices, CETA prime sponsors, community-based organizations, employers, and the general public. These groups are representative of direct interests in State coordinated efforts to expand job opportunities and improve the employability of its citizens.

I urge your cooperation in responding to the survey. It is recommended that completion of the survey be accomplished through an ad hoc assessment committee. The purpose of the committee is to insure that the information collected is representative of your agency needs. The ad hoc committee should therefore be made up of people including administrators, program planners, counselors, and other direct service providers on your staff who have a feel for your agency information needs. Assessment ratings and other survey responses should be determined by committee concensus. Please form your assessment committee as soon as possible so that the survey can be completed and returned by January 10, 1978.

If you have any questions concerning this survey, please call Dwight Meredith or me collect at 919/733-6700.

Cordially,

Joyce F. Kinnison
Director, NCSOICC

JFK/clw

List of Data Categories and Accompanying Data Elements

---

(1) Characteristics of workers customarily hired
(Traits and qualities generally associated with employer acceptance)

1. Educational attainment
2. Skill level
3. Interest patterns
4. Physical capabilities
5. Work experience
6. Age
7. Training background
8. Licenses, accreditations, certificates held

(2) Characteristics of 'typical' job
(Usual work performed in selected occupations)

1. Entry wage rates
2. Average wage rates
3. Duties and responsibilities
4. Working conditions and hours
5. Linkage with other jobs (promotions/transfers)
6. Licenses, accreditations, certificates required
7. Fringe benefits
8. Length of tenure
9. Hiring channels customarily used
10. Sources of labor supply customarily used
11. Apprenticeship opportunities
12. Training opportunities

(3) Employment patterns

1. Seasonal/stable
2. Vacancies generally filled by new hires/promotions (transfers)
3. Temporary/permanent
4. Full-time/part-time
5. Consideration of special applicants (disabled offenders, etc.)

(4) Turnover statistics

1. Accession rates (new hires and recalls)
2. Number of new hires
3. Number of recalls (re-hired)
4. Separation rates (quits, discharges, layoffs)
5. Number of quits
6. Number of lay-offs
7. Number of discharges

(5) Total employment

1. Number employed
2. Employment rate

(6) Job openings (vacancies)

1. By wage level
2. Number
3. Rate
4. Average length of time open
5. Reason for opening (expansion, quits, etc.)

(7) Employment requirements

1. Replacement needs
2. Expansion needs

(8) Unemployment statistics

1. Number
2. Rate

(9) Labor force statistics

1. Number in labor force
2. Participation rate

(10) Characteristics of employed
(Demographic characteristics of present labor force)

1. Employment status (full-time/part-time)
2. Commuting patterns
3. Licensed, certificated, etc.
4. Skill level
5. Education and training
6. Income (sources)
7. Number of weeks worked in last year
8. Work experience
9. Part-time/full-time

(11) Characteristics of unemployed

1. Occupation (last job)
2. Earnings (last job)
3. Length of unemployment
4. Reason for separation
5. Recall status
6. U.I. claimants
7. Skill level

8. Education and training
9. Number of periods of unemployment
10. Income (sources)

(12) Characteristics of discouraged workers
(Those who are not actively seeking work because they believe they would not find employment.)

1. Occupation (last job)
2. Earnings (last job)
3. Length of unemployment
4. Reason for separation
5. Skill level
6. Education and training
7. Number of periods of unemployment
8. Income (sources)

(13) Characteristics of underemployment
(Standard CETA definition)

1. Number working only part-time, seeking full-time
2. Number working full-time at or below poverty level

(14) Identification of employers (establishment name, address)

(15) Characteristics of military returnees

1. Skill level
2. Education and training

(16) Number of completers/leavers by education and training programs

1. Public certificate programs
2. Associate arts degree programs
3. Private certificate/associate degree programs
4. Public secondary general/academic programs
5. Public secondary vocational programs
6. Private secondary programs
7. Baccalaureate degree programs
8. Post-baccalaureate degree programs
9. Vocational rehabilitation programs
10. CETA programs
11. WIN programs
12. Community-based training programs
13. Apprenticeship programs
14. Private employer training programs
15. Union training programs

(17) Characteristics of completers/leavers by education and training programs

1. Reasons for leaving program
2. Number employed/unemployed
3. Type of employment by type of training
4. Wage rate of employed
5. Reasons for unemployment (in school, disabled, etc.)

(18) Number of enrollees by education and training programs

1. Public certificate programs
2. Associate arts degree programs
3. Private certificate/associate degree programs
4. Public secondary general/academic programs
5. Public secondary vocational programs
6. Private secondary programs
7. Baccalaureate degree programs
8. Post-baccalaureate degree programs
9. Vocational rehabilitation programs
10. CETA programs
11. WIN progra,s
12. Community-based training programs
13. Apprenticeship programs
14. Private employer training programs
15. Union training programs

(19) Occupational mobility
(Movement within occupation not due to geographic migration)

1. Occupational transfers
2. Re-entrants into labor force

(20) Population characteristics

1. Family size
2. Income of families and unrelated individuals
3. Household living costs
4. Mobility patterns (geographic movement)
5. Birth rates
6. Death rates by underlying causes
7. Fetal, infant, and neonatal death rates
8. Cases of communicable disease
9. Fertility patterns
10. Arrest rates

(21) Economic indicators

1. Hours and earnings
2. Wholesale sales
3. Retail sales
4. New business starts

5. Business expansions
6. Residential construction permits
7. Non-residential construction permits
8. Plant closings
9. Product output of manufacturers (durables)
10. Product output of manufacturers (non-durables)

(22) Fiscal information

1. Assessed property valuation
2. Property tax collected
3. Millage assessment
4. Income tax collected
5. Sales tax collected
6. Public program expenditures by program

(23) Education and training program characteristics

1. Program titles
2. Program descriptions
3. Eligibility requirements
4. Identification of program providers (name, address)
5. Budget
6. Support services offered

(24) Counseling and placement opportunities

1. Program title
2. Program description
3. Eligibility requirements
4. Identification of program providers (name, address)
5. Volume of placements
6. Budget